FOREIGN
BROADCAST
INFORMATION
SERVICE

Daily Report

Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-90-108
Tuesday
5 June 1990

Daily Report
Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-90-108

CONTENTS

5 June 1990

NOTICE TO READERS: An * indicates material not disseminated in electronic form.

WORLDWIDE ISSUES

- Perfilyev 4 Jun Briefing on World Issues ... 1
  - Summit Talks Termed 'Breakthrough' *[TASS]* ... 1
  - Shellings in Kabul Criticized *[TASS]* ... 1
  - European Process, Human Rights *[TASS]* ... 1
  - U.S. Veto on Middle East Viewed *[Moscow Radio]* ... 2
- U.S. Stance at Environment Conference Criticized *[PRAVDA 25 May]* ... 2
- Gorbachev Greets 'Teachers for Peace' Congress *[PRAVDA 1 Jun]* ... 2

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

United States & Canada

- Reportage on Gorbachev Visit to U.S. ... 3
  - Fitzwater-Maslennikov Hold Briefing *[IZVESTIYA 2 Jun]* ... 3
  - Gorbachev Walkabout in Washington *[Moscow TV]* ... 3
  - Baker Reviews Summit Progress *[TASS]* ... 4
  - Gorbachev Presented With Awards *[PRAVDA 3 Jun]* ... 5
  - Gorbachev Voices Gratitude for Awards *[Moscow Radio]* ... 5
  - Bush Speaks at Embassy Dinner *[TASS]* ... 6
  - Gorbachev, Shevardnadze Interviewed *[Moscow TV]* ... 6
  - Outcome Seen as 'Unusually Successful' *[Moscow TV]* ... 8
  - 'Great Days in Washington' Viewed *[PRAVDA 3 Jun]* ... 9
  - Arms Talks 'Completed Successfully' *[TASS]* ... 10
  - Bush Speaks at Document Signing *[PRAVDA 3 Jun]* ... 11
  - Officials Welcome Agreements *[TASS]* ... 12
  - IBM, Chevron Agreements Viewed *[Moscow TV]* ... 13
  - Gorbachev Arrives at Camp David *[TASS]* ... 14
  - Summit Briefing by Fitzwater *[TASS]* ... 14
  - Gorbachev Comments After Camp David *[Moscow TV]* ... 14
  - Gorbachev Values 'Personal Rapport' *[Moscow TV]* ... 16
  - Trade Treaty Ratification Viewed *[IZVESTIYA 3 Jun]* ... 16
  - Primakov Views 'Fruitful Summit' *[Moscow TV]* ... 18
  - Gorbachev News Conference Statement *[Moscow TV]* ... 18
  - Bush-Gorbachev News Conference *[Moscow TV]* ... 20
  - Gorbachev Departs With 'Fine Feelings' *[TASS]* ... 26
  - Gorbachev Arrives in Minneapolis *[TASS]* ... 26
  - Gorbachev Greeted Upon Arrival *[Moscow TV]* ... 26
  - Gorbachev Stresses Cooperation *[Moscow TV]* ... 26
  - Meeting With Businessmen Previewed *[TASS]* ... 27
  - Gorbachev Addresses U.S. Businessmen *[TASS]* ... 28
  - Gorbachev Remarks on Proposed Institute *[TASS]* ... 30
  - Gorbachev Visits Control Data Headquarters *[TASS]* ... 30
  - Gorbachev Finds Midwest 'Staggering' *[Moscow TV]* ... 31
  - Gorbachev Comments on Middle East *[TASS]* ... 31
  - Gorbachev Speaks at Governor's House *[Moscow TV]* ... 31
  - Gorbachev Walkabout at Governor's House *[Moscow TV]* ... 32
  - 'Joint Statement' Issued on Ethiopia *[PRAVDA 4 Jun]* ... 32
  - Gorbachev Arrives in San Francisco *[TASS]* ... 32
  - Californians Welcome Gorbachev *[TASS]* ... 32

  - Gorbachev's 4 Jun Agenda Viewed *[Moscow Radio]* 33
  - Gorbachev Meets With Reagan *[TASS]* 33

China

- PRC Military Delegation Continues Visit 33
  - Belousov Receives General Liu *[IZVESTIYA 3 Jun]* 33
  - Yazov, Liu Discuss Military Relations *[TASS]* 34
- Laptev Talks With PRC Minister Wei *[IZVESTIYA Jun 4]* 34
- Delegation Reaches Trade Accord With PRC *[Moscow TV]* 34
- SRV, PRC Agree on Cambodian Government *[Moscow International]* 35

Northeast Asia

- Gorbachev Meets South Korean President *[Moscow International]* 35
  - Gorbachev Comments on ROK Ties *[TASS]* 35
- Changing World Justifies Trade Ties With ROK *[Maksimov in KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 2 Jun]* 36
- Soviet Trade Festival Opens in Seoul *[IZVESTIYA 29 May]* 36
- South Korean Economic Delegation To Visit *[TASS]* 37

Southeast Asia & Pacific

- UN Cambodia Parley Maps Out Settlement Terms *[PRAVDA 31 May]* 37
- Observer Views Sihanouk Cease-Fire Statement *[Alekseyev on Moscow International]* 38
- Hun Sen Stops in Moscow, Talks With Official *[PRAVDA 3 June]* 38
- U.S. Debates Ban on Import of Burmese Products *[Moscow International]* 38
- Reasons for Burmese Opposition Victory Examined *[Moscow International]* 39

Near East & South Asia

- Israel Invites Gorbachev To View Resettlement *[Moscow TV]* 39
- Israel's Jaffe Cited on Occupied Territories *[IZVESTIYA 25 May]* 39
- Israeli Labor Party Paying for Stance in Cairo *[Prokofyev on Radio Peace and Progress]* 40
- Shamir Refusal of UN Mediation Denounced *[Balebanov on TASS]* 40
- Arab Dialogue Organization Meets in Moscow *[TASS]* 41
  - Kuwait's KUNA Reports on Meeting 41
- Discussions Described *[TASS]* 42
- Paper Surveys Outcome of Baghdad Summit *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 1 June]* 42
- Arab Summit Praised for 'Realism,' 'Restraint' *[PRAVDA 2 June]* 43
- Andreyev Views Iran's Stand on Baghdad Summit *[Moscow International]* 44
- Iranian Envoy, Belonogov Discuss Soviet Jews *[Tehran IRNA]* 45
- Prospects for Iran-Iraq Peace Talks Analyzed *[Radio Peace and Progress]* 45
- Significance of Iran-Iraq Correspondence Noted *[Radio Peace and Progress]* 46
  - Commentary on Iraq's Second Letter *[Moscow International]* 46
  - Further on Correspondence *[Andreyev on Moscow International]* 47
- Reports on Iranian Hostages' Fate Discussed *[Andreyev on Moscow International]* 47
- Soviet Official Weighs Iran Revolution Impact *[Tehran Radio]* 48

Sub-Saharan Africa

- Lukyanov Receives Lenin Prize Committee Members *[PRAVDA 31 May]* 48
- Lukyanov Praises Peace Prize Award to Mandela *[TASS]* 49
- Academician Affirms Support for African Allies *[Moscow International]* 49

East Europe

- Landsbergis News Briefing in CSFR Reported *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 2 June]* 49
- Gorbachev Appoints Shikin Envoy to GDR *[TASS]* 50
- Polish Historian Interviewed on Pact Issues *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 30 May]* 50
- Troop Withdrawal From Poland Broadcast on TV *[Moscow TV]* 51

IZVESTIYA Cites Walesa-Mazowiecki Conflict *[27 May]* ... 51
Polish Solidarity Finds Power 'a Burden' *[PRAVDA 31 May]* ... 52
Laptev Receives Polish Parliamentarians *[IZVESTIYA 3 June]* ... 53

West Europe

Official Views Upcoming Thatcher Visit *[TASS]* ... 53
Shevardnadze Arrives in Copenhagen *[Moscow Radio]* ... 54
  Meets With Minister *[TASS]* ... 54
Reportage on Turkish Parliamentary Visit ... 54
  Gorbachev Sends Greetings *[IZVESTIYA 3 Jun]* ... 54
  Ryzhkov Sends Greetings *[IZVESTIYA 3 Jun]* ... 54
  Relations Viewed *[Ankara ANATOLIA 3 Jun]* ... 54
Laptev, Italian Parliamentarians Discuss Ties *[TASS]* ... 55
Finnish Premier Visits Murmansk, Pollution Viewed *[PRAVDA 25 May]* ... 55
Analyst Critical of Norwegian Premier Remarks *[TASS]* ... 55
Foundation To Publish Marx-Engels Works *[PRAVDA 31 May]* ... 56

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

Supreme Soviet Session

Boyko Speaks on Market Economy 29 May *[Moscow TV]* ... 57
Moscow TV Reports Supreme Soviet Session 4 Jun ... 58
Session Adopts Law on Enterprises *[TASS]* ... 59
Details of New Enterprise Law Viewed *[TASS]* ... 59
Supreme Soviet Presidium Discusses Issues *[TASS]* ... 59
Agenda for Supreme Soviet Session Outlined *[Moscow Radio]* ... 60
Supreme Soviet Session Extended for Further Week *[TASS]* ... 60

Political & Social

'All-Union' Political Strike Preparations Begin *[Vilnius Radio]* ... 60
Youth Sit-In Staged on Tiananmen Anniversary *[AFP]* ... 61
Vnukovo Airport 'Paralyzed' by Plane Shortage *[Moscow TV]* ... 61
Yeltsin Among Delegates Elected to Congress *[PRAVDA 2 Jun]* ... 61
Ligachev Interviewed at Komsomol Congress *[BAKINSKIY RABOCHIY 16 May]* ... 62
Preparations for Peasant Union Founding Congress *[Moscow TV]* ... 63
Various Party Committees Elect First Secretaries *[PRAVDA 2 Jun]* ... 63

Economic

Commodities Exchange To Be Set Up For Economy *[IZVESTIYA 4 Jun]* ... 64
Voronezh Citizens Cited on Economic Transition *[Moscow TV]* ... 64
Impact of Price Hikes on Family Budgets Examined *[TRUD 31 May]* ... 65
Shatalin Comments on Market, Federation Rebirth
  [LITERATURNAYA GAZETA No 20] ... 66
'Mir' Business Cooperation Association Formed *[TASS]* ... 70
Tenkinskiy Gold Industry Faces Problems *[Moscow TV]* ... 71

Military

Panafidin Denies Bias Against Uzbek Draftees *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 31 May]* ... 71
Border Guards' Work at Polish Crossing Profiled *[Moscow TV]* ... 72
Impact of Economic Reform on Defense Sector *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 19 May]* ... 72
Soviet Aircraft Displayed at U.S. Aviation Show *[TASS]* ... 75
'Unique' Soviet Bomber Sets World Records *[Moscow International]* ... 75

REGIONAL AFFAIRS

Baltic Republics

Lithuanian Economic Situation Detailed *[Vilnius Radio]* 76
Pro-CPSU Party Congress Held in Lithuania *[PRAVDA 4 Jun]* 76
Savisaar Letter to Secretary Baker Published *[MOLODEZH ESTONII 18 May]* 77
Law on Provisional Government of Estonia Noted *[SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA 18 May]* 78
Riga Radio Carries 4 June Latvian Supreme Soviet 79
  Agenda Debated 79
  Internal Affairs Minister Elected 79
  Pensions To Be Debated 80
Proceedings of Latvian Supreme Soviet Reported *[Riga Radio]* 80
Two Die in Latvian Factory Explosion *[Moscow TV]* 81
Latvian 'Equality' Faction Protests Declaration *[SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA 9 May]* 81
  'Equality' Leader Interviewed *[SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA 8 May]* 81
Latvian Labor Collectives Oppose Declaration *[SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA 9 May]* 83
Rubiks Opposes Independence Declaration *[SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA 9 May]* 84
Latvian Government Appointments Published *[SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA 9 May]* 85

RSFSR

RSFSR Congress Resumes Session 5 June *[Moscow Radio]* 86
Moscow TV Relays 4 June Congress Proceedings 86
  Khasbulatov Outlines Program 86
  Coverage Debated 87
  Work Schedule Debated 88
  Health Care Viewed 89
  Candidates Debated 90
Leadership Candidates Address RSFSR Congress *[TASS]* 91
Yeltsin, Deputies Consider Deputy Chairmen *[Moscow Radio]* 91
Yeltsin Candidates Fail To Win Election *[TASS]* 92
Stalemate, 'No Positive Advances' at Congress *[Moscow Radio]* 92
Deputies of Congress 'Divided' Over Issues *[TASS]* 93
New Leningrad Soviet Chairman Interviewed *[LITERATURNAYA GAZETA No 12]* 93
Khabarovsk Party Conference First Stage Ends *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 5 Jun]* 95
Razumovskiy Loses Election in Krasnodar Kray *[Moscow TV]* 96
Ecological Situation in White Sea Worsens *[Moscow Radio]* 96
Mudslides Hit Chechen-Ingush Oil Workers' Town *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 5 Jun]* 96
Gorbachev Intervention in Monastery Cited *[PRAVDA 3 Jun]* 96

Western Republics

Ivashko Elected Ukraine Supreme Soviet President *[TASS]* 96
  To Relinquish Party Post *[Moscow TV]* 97
Meeting Protests Ivashko Holding Two Posts *[Kiev International]* 97
Ukrainian Republican Party Meets 3 June *[Kiev International]* 97
Donetsk Miners Stress Needs at Meeting *[Moscow TV]* 97
Transcarpathian Radar Station Plan Halted *[Moscow TV]* 98
Interfront Seeking 'Alternative Power Base' *[Vilnius Radio]* 98
Congress of Non-Moldavian Deputies Meets *[Moscow TV]* 99
'Sharp' Interethnic Problems in Moldavia Noted *[Moscow International]* 99
Split Reported in Moldavian Parliament *[RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA 29 May]* 100
Moldavian Commission Chairpersons Elected *[SOVETSKAYA MOLDAVIYA 23 May]* 100
Moldavian Central Committee Holds Plenary Session *[Moscow Radio]* 100

Caucasus

Second Round of Elections Held in Armenia on 3 June *[Yerevan Radio]* 101
  More on Elections *[ARMENPRES]* 101
Armenian Ministry Reports Weapons Seizures *[Yerevan Radio]* 101

New Armenian Interior Minister Appointed *[Yerevan Radio]* 101
Nationalists Say Moscow Behind 27 May Events *[Yerevan International]* 101
Funeral of Officer Killed in Armenia Described *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 1 Jun]* 102
Armenian Draft Law on Presidential Post Published *[Yerevan International]* 103
New Organ of Georgian Council of Ministers *[ZARYA VOSTOKA 9 May]* 103

Central Asia

Turkmen Party Apparatus To Face 30 Percent Cut *[PRAVDA 4 Jun]* 103
Uzbek Authorities 'Forced' To Restrict Sales *[IZVESTIYA 1 Jun]* 103
State of Emergency Declared in Kirghizia *[TASS]* 103
  Housing Causes Clashes *[AFP]* 104
  Deaths, Injuries Reported *[AFP]* 104
Report on Sentencing of Kazakh Election Fraudsters *[IZVESTIYA 3 Jun]* 104
Kazakh Social Democratic Party Founded *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 3 Jun]* 104
Eastern Border District Holds Party Conference *[Alma-Ata Radio]* 105

Perfilyev 4 Jun Briefing on World Issues

Summit Talks Termed 'Breakthrough'

LD0406140890 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1330 GMT 4 Jun 90

[Text] Moscow, 4 Jun (TASS)—TASS diplomatic correspondents Ivan Ivanov and Yuriy Rublevskiy report from the USSR Foreign Ministry press center:

"A key event of world politics" is how the state visit of the USSR President to the United States has been described by Vadim Perfilyev, deputy head of the USSR Foreign Ministry Information Directorate. He was speaking today at a briefing at the USSR Foreign Ministry press center.

"And although it is too early to sum up and analyze its final results, one can already say definitely, now that the official part is over, that the talks in Washington have been a success," the USSR Foreign Ministry spokesman said. Thus, he continued, the summit has fully come up to expectations. Vadim Perfilyev noted in this connection that "today we have reason to speak of a breakthrough in many areas, including disarmament." On other issues, too, considerable progress was achieved, and there were signs of a movement toward mutually acceptable solutions.

After recalling that a whole range of important and promising agreements has been signed, the spokesman stressed that "new horizons of cooperation are opening before our countries."

"The significance of the Washington talks lies above all in the imparting of stability to the positive processes of change in the world," Vadim Perfilyev said. This meeting of the presidents of the United States and USSR has been the first since the end of the cold war, the symbolic hatchet of which was buried at the bottom of the Mediterranean after Malta. The Washington meeting has shown the willingness of the world's two greatest states to engage in vigorous collaboration in search of answers to the challenges of our time. It has confirmed the irreversibility of the process of overcoming confrontation and laid the foundation for new structures of cooperation in the "post-postwar" world, the USSR Foreign Ministry spokesman stressed.

Shellings in Kabul Criticized

LD0406171790 Moscow TASS in English 1704 GMT 4 Jun 90

[Text] Moscow June 4 TASS—Militants from the Afghan military opposition have intensified shellings of Kabul in May, coinciding with the convening of the Loya Jerga and the Soviet-U.S. summit, Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman Vadim Perfilyev told a briefing here today.

Over 314 missiles, most of them of a cluster type, were fired at Kabul, killing 57 and injuring 217 civilians. Corresponding figures in April were 127, 52 and 122, he said.

Such actions have not earned military opposition leaders prestige but demonstrated their adherence to old methods of resolving the Afghan problem by force instead of the logic and principles of humanism, Perfilyev said.

The Afghan "irreconcilable" opposition are beefing up their combat activities, yet at the same time, amendments to the country's constitution, adopted by the Loya Jerga, were published in Kabul. They state that Afghanistan is an independent and indivisible Islamic state and political pluralism is the foundation of its political system, he said.

European Process, Human Rights

LD0406202390 Moscow TASS in English 2014 GMT 4 Jun 90

[Text] Moscow June 4 TASS—The Soviet Union attaches great importance to the meeting to open in Copenhagen on June 5 of the conference on human dimension of the European process, Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman Vadim Perfilyev told a briefing here today.

According to Perfilyev, the Soviet Union intends to press for the discussion of humanitarian problems to contribute to the realisation in full measure of human rights and facilitate the conclusion of the conference at its next meeting in Moscow in 1991 with "weighty, practically tangible results."

The Soviet spokesman noted that the strict observance of the Vienna agreements in the humanitarian area has a double importance—from the point of view of implementing its international pledges, and, which is no less important, from the point of view of incorporating world standards in the process oF democratizing Soviet society and forming a law-governed state.

He said that the establishment of a common legal space for all participants of the Conference for Security and Cooperation in Europe was a high-priority task and stressed the need to reach an agreement on Europen criteria for a modern law-governed state and to achieve the supremacy of the law.

The Soviet Union, the spokesman said, proceeds from the assumption that legal stability is an integral component of the steadfast development of the Europe-scale process and universal respect for human rights.

Perfilyev said it was very important at present to comprehensively consider the issue of ethnic minority rights. According to him, it is time to think about a search for joint solutions to such international problems as brain drain and refugee status.

The Soviet Union, he said, is open to cooperation with everybody, it favours a meaningful mutually enriching dialogue capable of accelerating the process towards the achievement of compatibility of legal parameteres of states participating in the European process and of facilitating the strict observance of human rights.

U.S. Veto on Middle East Viewed

LD0106181590 Moscow World Service in English 1110 GMT 1 Jun 90

[Text] The United States has blocked once again the passing by the United Nations Security Council of a resolution on the Middle East. It vetoed down the project providing for the establishment of a commission of three Security Council members to study the situation on the Israeli occupied territories and prepare recommendations for the protection of civilians there. Aleksandr Pogodin makes this comment:

One vote of the United States, the Security Council's permanent member, has overruled the opinion of 14 countries who supported the draft resolution. One cannot question the juridical aspect of this matter. One can't go against the law, after all. But there is also the moral and political aspects that are worthy of mentioning. The appearance of the draft resolution, proposed by a group of nonaligned countries, was the outcome of prolonged negotiations. They purported to find formulas that would suit the United States and would help avoid the threat of its veto. According to news agencies reports, though unconfirmed officially, the American delegation accepted at first that very discreet variant of the resolution that we were talking about. But as soon as Israel declared that it was against the draft resolution, Washington changed its course immediately. The American veto deprived the Security Council of the opportunity to consider independently the situation on the occupied territories. Well, Tel Aviv is obviously grateful to the United States for its move but it will hardly bring anything good to peace in the Middle East.

U.S. Stance at Environment Conference Criticized

PM3005124790 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 25 May 90 First Edition p 7

[Report by PRAVDA correspondent Yu. Kuznetsov: "International Conference in Bergen Ends Without Notable Success"]

[Text] Helsinki—Participants in the International Conference on Environmental Protection met in the Norwegian city of Bergen with great expectations. Representatives of 34 countries were due to discuss the ecological situation in the world today and draw up measures to improve it.

The conference followed on from suggestions by the so-called "Brundtland Commission," a special worldwide organization operating within the framework of the United Nations with Gru Harlem Brundtland, well-known Norwegian politician and public figure, as its president. The commission's report, published in 1987, greatly facilitated the stepping up of efforts by defenders of the environment.

The Bergen conference, as its participants noted, could become a new landmark in UN activity. This was made possible by the fact that it attracted not only government representatives, experts, and scientists, but also businessmen and trade union and public figures of the broadest orientations.

Over the course of three days, the meeting participants tried to work out a common line and binding recommendations for their governments. However, largely owing to the position adopted by U.S. representatives, they did not succeed in making effective decisions. The resolution approved at the meeting contains only an indication that "a majority of countries" wish to restrict harmful emissions, above all carbon dioxide emissions, into the atmosphere over the next few years. As commentators noted, "U.S. opposition" was due to the fact that U.S. enterprises account for 25 percent of total carbon dioxide emissions into the planet's atmosphere, and the installation of additional purification plants would require large expenses on the part of corporations.

The meeting participants also failed to reach agreement on the question of providing economic aid to developing countries and support for the "ecological efforts" by East European countries. Representatives of the "Greenpeace" international organization declared in this context that the Bergen conference should even be considered a "step backward." Addressing the conference, Finnish Environment Minister Kaj Barlund expressed his regret that, as he put it, so far there is obviously not enough political will to implement decisions which might radically change our environment for the better.

Gorbachev Greets 'Teachers for Peace' Congress

PM0106112990 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 1 Jun 90 Second Edition p 1

[M. Gorbachev message to "Teachers for Peace" Congress]

[Text] To the participants of the Third International "Teachers For Peace" Congress

I cordially greet the participants of the Third International "Teachers For Peace" congress and I wish it great creative success in its work.

Mankind is hopeful about the future. You teachers at all levels of education are preparing your charges for this future, for a peaceful, creative, safe, and happy life. You are giving them access to the treasure-house of knowledge and to mankind's inexhaustible spiritual values and are molding the individual's sense of moral responsibility for his actions.

I am sure that the work of the congress and its comprehensive discussion of the pedagogical aspects of topical issues will be a substantial contribution to strengthening mutual understanding among teachers of different countries, improving the education of the younger generation in the spirit of friendship among the peoples, and uniting the public's efforts in strengthening world peace.

United States & Canada

Reportage on Gorbachev Visit to U.S.

Fitzwater-Maslennikov Hold Briefing

PM0406122190 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 2 Jun 90 Morning Edition p 5

[TASS report: "First Briefings"]

[Text] Washington, 1 Jun—A.A. Maslennikov and Marlin Fitzwater, the USSR and U.S. presidents' press secretaries, held their first joint briefings Thursday at the international press center of the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting, where approximately 6,000 American and foreign journalists, including 180 Soviet correspondents, are accredited.

Opening the daily briefing, M. Fitzwater said the following: "This is our presidents' second summit meeting. The meeting in Malta was profoundly optimistic for both sides. Our presidents began to prepare for a new era of cooperation then. They have had their first round of talks today, during which they examined difficult problems linked with the changes in the nature of East-West relations. The United States and the Soviet Union have clearly taken a number of confident steps away from conflict toward cooperation in bilateral relations. Thanks to the difficult work carried out at talks between our representatives over the last few weeks and months, our two presidents will sign a number of promising agreements for international peace Friday."

M. Fitzwater noted that during the USSR and U.S. presidents' morning conversation the "discussion touched on the whole range of questions featured at this summit meeting and was a prelude to the concrete discussions that lie ahead. The meeting was a friendly one. Both presidents spoke optimistically about their countries' future. At a separate meeting in the White House Secretary of State J. Baker and Foreign Minister E.A. Shevardnadze examined numerous agreements and joint statements that will be signed."

Fitzwater was asked: "Will a trade agreement be signed?" "It is impossible to tell at present," he said. "The presidents have not yet specially discussed this question."

The two presidents' first conversation, A.A. Maslennikov continued, "was of a general, conceptual nature, and touched on the vision of the future held by the two countries' leaders—the vision of our two countries' place in the international context, in the context of the development of the situation in Europe. The talks were businesslike, frank, and very constructive. Both presidents agreed that a very good start has been made for the more detailed discussion ahead."

"President Bush mentioned Lithuania and the disagreements between the two countries on this question. What is the Soviet reaction to Bush's words?" Maslennikov was asked. "Lithuania is the Soviet Union's internal problem," he replied, "since it is part of the USSR, and this problem must be resolved on the basis of our constitution, on the basis of the laws adopted by our parliament."

At the evening briefing Fitzwater and Maslennikov said that during their second conversation M.S. Gorbachev and G. Bush "had indicated that we are now at a turning point in history when so many countries are turning to democracy and carrying out significant reforms in the political and military spheres. President Bush said that, although we have our differences, he believes that our relations will become better and better. The conversation was mainly connected with the question of German unification. It was agreed that the foreign minister, the secretary of state, and their experts will continue working on the questions under discussion. The two leaders had an in-depth exchange of opinions which resulted in a better understanding of their positions. Many ideas need to be further elaborated and will be considered at ministerial level. This was a very constructive and useful conversation."

The following question was asked in connection with the interview that M.S. Gorbachev and G. Bush gave on Thursday: "Why do the two leaders not believe that the German problem can be settled at this meeting?" "Because it is up to Germany to make the final decision," the White House press secretary replied. "They had a very intense, very friendly discussion, but were unable to reach a unanimous opinion," Maslennikov added. "But the very fact that they asked ministers and experts to work together on this problem indicates that progress has been made. Our impression is that they have begun to move toward each other, rather than in opposite directions. A long difficult road to consensus lies ahead. But it is very important that this is the road to agreement rather than disagreement." Asked about the nature of the relations that have taken shape between the two presidents, Fitzwater said that they are "very constructive."

Gorbachev Walkabout in Washington

LD0306200490 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 3 Jun 90

[Report by correspondent Ptashnikov; from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [Ptashnikov] Many of the people of Washington linked the current visit by President Gorbachev to the U.S. capital not only with his talks in the White House with George Bush. They remembered very well how, three years ago, during just such a visit, he surprised everyone. He unexpectedly left his car on one of the streets of the city, and talked for several minutes with the passers-by who had immediately surrounded him. How much delight there was at that time. The people of Washington expected that this time, too, history would repeat itself. Correspondents were also ready for this. Their expectations were born out. Again, an unplanned stop, and moreover the second during his visit. Again, an immense, delighted crowd, hands stretched for shaking, happy faces. [video shows limousines driving through streets lined with crowds, then Gorbachev standing next to his car and talking to crowds]

[Gorbachev] I welcome the young people. The fact that young people are showing such interest in what is happening during the visit, and our conversation with your president, this is very important. You must know that in our country, among all strata, but especially among young people, there is a great desire to move toward you, to cooperate and then to make friends! [applause] What do you want to say to me? [many replies, Gorbachev smiles, expressions of thanks from crowd] Thanks to you! [applause]

[Ptashnikov] So as not to offend the people of Washington who found themselves on the other side of the street, Mikhail Sergeyevich also approached them. [video shows Gorbachev shaking hands with people, several who shout: We love you.]

[Gorbachev] Another thing: Your feelings are very important to me. I can understand without words you favor that everything that is happening between our countries, peoples, young people, should proceed in this way, develop, gain in strength and improve. [more shouts: We love you]

[Ptashnikov] We love you! one of the women taking part in this meeting cried in farewell. You will agree, comrades, such declarations in the United States, addressed to the Soviet president, are worth a great deal. [video shows Gorbachev being escorted back to his car by bodyguards, crowds continue to applaud]

Baker Reviews Summit Progress

LD0206125790 Moscow TASS in English 0818 GMT 2 Jun 90

[By TASS correspondent Oleg Polyakovsky]

[Text] Washington June 2 TASS—"While we still have a full day of informal meetings left tomorrow at Camp David, I review for you now the progress that I think we've made to date," U.S. Secretary of State James Baker told a news conference at the international press centre of the Soviet-American summit on Friday.

About 6,000 American and foreign journalists, including 180 Soviet correspondents, are accredited at the centre.

Baker's news conference immediately followed the signing of a series of Soviet-American agreements in the White House.

"On nuclear arms control, I think we've made tangible progress. President Bush and President Gorbachev have just issued joint statements on a S.T.A.R.T. treaty and on future negotiations on nuclear and space arms," Baker said.

"In the joint statement on S.T.A.R.T. they have agreed upon almost all of the major substantive issues. And we now believe that we may be able to sign the actual treaty sometime later this year.

"Completion of this particular treaty, of course, will not end our commitment to reducing the risk of nuclear war. Our statement on future negotiations outlines a practical approach to further enhancing strategic stability".

Enumerating agreements signed on Friday, Baker specially touched upon chemical weapons, emphasising:

"I don't think it's an exaggeration to say that this agreement (a bilateral agreement on chemical weapons) will set in motion a pathway to a multilateral convention for banning and destroying chemical weapons worldwide".

"On conventional forces in Europe [CFE], we think that this summit has helped somewhat to narrow the gaps between the two sides".

"Both sides have indicated in a joint statement their commitment to concluding a CFE agreement this year," he added.

Recalling the signing of a commercial trade agreement, the U.S. secretary of state pointed out that President Bush's long-standing condition was that the most-favoured nation-(MFN) trading status would not be granted to the Soviet Union until it passes its emigration legislation. "This agreement will not be sent to the Congress until after such legislation has been enacted," Baker said.

"I would add that I think we are leaving the cold war behind by expanding and strengthening the ties between our two countries".

"I think we've made workmanlike progress across the full spectrum of our relations," Baker said, noting that "real disagreements do remain" over the Baltic republics and German reunification.

"While we did not narrow our differences on these two issues, we did heighten, I think, our understanding of each other's concerns," he said.

Moving to answers to questions, Baker emphasised: "While the cold war might be characterised by the balance of terror, today, I think, U.S.-Soviet relations stand on the steadier ground of a balance of interests. And as we move forward, our job will be not so much to avoid war as to build peace by searching creatively for the interests that we and the rest of the world have in common".

In response to questions about the commercial trade agreement, Baker said that there had been no formal linkage, "By anybody in this administration that I am aware of", between the granting of MFN to the Soviet Union and the situation concerning Lithuania but that there had been a direct linkage with the passage of the emigration legislation by the Supreme Soviet.

The commercial agreement "is in the interests of both countries," the U.S. secretary of state pointed out.

"Is the failure to resolve the German question here likely to prevent achieving a CFE agreement?" Baker was asked.

"We are very hopeful that we can move forward and conclude this CFE agreement," he answered.

Gorbachev Presented With Awards

PM0406131990 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 3 Jun 90 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Presentation to M.S. Gorbachev of Prizes and Honorary Awards from U.S. Public Organizations"]

[Text] Washington, 2 Jun—A ceremony in which the USSR president was presented with prizes and honorary awards from influential U.S. public organizations was held at the Soviet Embassy in Washington 1 June in a ceremonial and friendly atmosphere.

For his great fruitful activity in bringing about the practical implementation of the ideas of new thinking in strengthening international security M.S. Gorbachev was presented with the Franklin Delano Roosevelt Freedom Medal. This top award bears the name of the U.S. president who headed his country during the war when the allies fought against Hitlerite fascism. Speaking at the ceremony, Anne Roosevelt—F. Roosevelt's granddaughter—said, addressing M.S. Gorbachev: "Whatever the future may hold, the work done by you will be a beacon for many years to come." Warm words of welcome were also addressed to the USSR president by William Van Den Heuvel, president of the Franklin Roosevelt Institute.

Representatives of the Albert Einstein Peace Prize Foundation presented M.S. Gorbachev with the Albert Einstein Peace Prize for his enormous contribution to the struggle for peace and mutual understanding among the peoples. This was discussed in a heartfelt and interested way by the well known public figure Paul Warnke and the eminent writer Norman Cousins.

Arthur Schneier, president of the Appeal of Conscience Foundation—one of the most influential religious organizations in the United States—presented the USSR president with the "Historic Figure" honorary prize. He briefed those present on the creation of a special U.S.-Soviet "Gorbachev student exchange program," particularly emphasizing the Soviet leader's constant concern for the future of the world's young generation.

The international prize named for Martin Luther King—an outstanding campaigner for the American people's rights—was presented to M.S. Gorbachev by Lorens Ways [name as transliterated], president of the "World of Friends" College, and King's widow—Coretta King. Presenting the Martin Luther King Medal "For a World Without Violence 1991" to Mikhail Sergeyevich, Coretta King stated: "This award symbolizes a new era in relations between countries and peoples and consists of the prize—a medallion depicting M.L. King and the inscription 'M.L. King Award "For A World Without Violence 1991."' It is awarded to President Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev for his outstanding role in the struggle for world peace and human rights."

Making a speech in reply, M.S. Gorbachev expressed profound and cordial gratitude to the U.S. public organizations and figures which have presented him with such important and memorable awards. The USSR president particularly stressed that he sees the awards which have been presented primarily as major recognition by the U.S. public of the role of Soviet people, who are implementing the large-scale processes of renewal and perestroyka in all spheres of life in the Soviet Union.

"You can hope," M.S. Gorbachev noted, "that we in the Soviet Union are well aware of our role and responsibility in the current world. Our people will not break under the burden of their responsibility and will do everything to ensure that the hopes we are pinning on perestroyka come to fruition."

Talking about the positive progress in Soviet-U.S. relations, M.S. Gorbachev stressed: "If this progress is maintained and if it becomes even stronger, it promises remarkable results for our peoples and—by dint of the prestige which they hold in the world—for the entire world as well."

The presentation ceremony was attended by prominent members of Congress, well known public figures and scientists, representatives of the business world, and the relatives of F. Roosevelt and M.L. King. Taking part in the ceremony on the Soviet side were Yu.A. Osipyan, Ye.M. Primakov, S.S. Shatalin, A.S. Dzasokhov, G.A. Arbatov, D.S. Likhachev, F.M. Burlatskiy, and G.A. Borovik.

Gorbachev Voices Gratitude for Awards

LD0206120490 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0230 GMT 2 Jun 90

[Special correspondent Andrey Ptashnikov report from Washington]

[Text] Within the framework of the official visit of USSR President Gorbachev to the United States a festive ceremony of investing him with a whole series of U.S. and international prizes and awards took place in the Soviet embassy. Comrade Gorbachev was awarded the 1990 international peace prize named after Martin Luther King, a medal in the name of Doctor King, and the Albert Einstein Peace Prize for his huge contribution to halting the arms race and strengthening world peace. Speaking after his investiture with these medals, Comrade Gorbachev said:

[Begin Gorbachev recording] Esteemed ladies and gentlemen, respected representatives of the Albert Einstein Peace Prize Foundation, I am, in general, in such an emotional state now, which prevents me despite all of my political experience and opportunities for contacts with people from finding suitable words to express to you those feelings which I am going through and experiencing. Several very authoritative public organizations in the United States have done me a great honor in awarding a prize which appraises my activities. This is a great incentive for me in those activities which I am undertaking and also in the struggle in which I am participating on the basis of my profoundly considered choice. I accept the prize bearing the name of the great man, Albert Einstein, possibly one of the most brilliant and great minds of which we know, as your support, as your appraisal of what is being done and of what is occurring in my homeland today. It is said that close-up nothing is seen, a lot is seen at a distance. The fact that you have seen today, living together with us and observing us from here, from the Western hemisphere, and are so highly evaluating our efforts for perestroyka, the renewal of our society, we in the Soviet Union and I personally highly evaluate this.

Evidently, we will be correct if we state today that we are again, our two countries, our two peoples, have turned out to be, in such a situation where we are meeting one another half-way. If this movement is maintained, if it gathers even more strength then this promises remarkable results and fruits for our two people and countries and by virtue of the weight, the role and authority which they have in the world, for the whole world. The best minds of humanity have dreamed of this, Albert Einstein dreamed of this, one of the most humane people in our common human history, and I thank you all for the honor given to me. Thank you. [applause] [end recording]

During the ceremony Comrade Gorbachev was also invested with the honorary award of Historic Figure established by the public foundation named "Call to Conscience". He was conferred with this award for his activities which have inspired the people of the planet with confidence in their future. Representatives of the foundation also declared the establishment from next year of a President Gorbachev scholarship for 10 Soviet students who will study in the United States. And finally, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev was awarded a Franklin Delano Roosevelt freedom medal for his guaranteeing of the democratic rights and freedoms of the Soviet people.

Bush Speaks at Embassy Dinner

LD0206082290 Moscow TASS in English 0626 GMT 2 Jun 90

[Text] Washington June 2 TASS—The week now ended was marked by "historic" agreements on both nuclear and chemical arms, U.S. President George Bush said on Friday when speaking at a dinner given in his honour by Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev at the Soviet Embassy in Washington.

These agreements, Bush said, have been shaped by a "remembrance of shared interests and a recommitment to forging a just and lasting peace. And they stand as a memorial not to the past, but to the future. A memorial to wars that need never be fought, to the hardship and suffering that need never be endured."

"True peace takes more than just laying down of arms, it also requires the reaching out of hands," Bush emphasised.

"Americans and Soviets have often tended to think of our two countries as being on opposite sides of almost everything, including the opposite sides of the world. But we share an important northern border. And we are, in fact, next-door neighbours across the Bering Sea," he said.

"And today, we've also signed an agreement fixing our maritime boundary in the Bering Sea area and announced our agreement to establish a U.S.-Soviet park across the Bering Strait—a new gateway to the Arctic and a new gateway to the future," the U.S. President said.

He also praised other Soviet-American documents agreed upon and signed on Friday.

Gorbachev, Shevardnadze Interviewed

LD0206201690 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1816 GMT 2 Jun 90

[Interview with USSR President Mikhail Gorbachev and Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze by APN correspondent Aleksandr Polzikov in Washington; date not specified—recorded]

[Text] [Polzikov] Mikhail Sergeyevich, Eduard Amvrosiyevich, the official part has practically finished. Do you not see this meeting as, well, one point in that process which could be called the conversion of political relations in today's changing world? And, if so, do you have an understanding with President Bush? And perhaps immediately a second question: Who are we today? How will we be tomorrow in relation to one another: rivals, partners, opponents, neighbors, friends?

[Gorbachev] You put it very successfully; perhaps you have heard my discourse on this topic, and for this reason picked it up in your question, but I think that, yes, there was confrontation and there was opposition between our peoples and between East and West. Usually, if this occurs between us, then this occurs to the whole, as well. And we know where we have been—to the brink of the precipice. We have piled up so many weapons that we do not know now even how to rid ourselves of them. Well, in general, I hope that we will be able to rid ourselves of them; we are moving along this path, the current visit is contributing to this. But we, after all, have spoiled relations, sowed suspicions against one another, and have exhausted the resources, primarily, of two such powerful states as ours and the United States. We have so many problems. We must resolve them. I must say that rich America also has its own great problems, and also needs to free resources to resolve these problems. So we have moved away from confrontation.

There was, and there probably still remains, a period of rivalry. Some people would like this to be so, too. There are pronouncements on this count, made by quite major representatives, politologists, and by a kind of political front of influential people to the effect that in some way or another relations between our two states and peoples are doomed to always be hallmarked by rivalry. I do not think that is so.

Signs of partnership are already appearing. This does not only relate to the sphere of the economy, but also to cooperation for the resolution of global problems, and I must say for untying the knot of the regional conflicts which have accumulated. There are, after all, already the realities of this cooperation, partnership. So I think: From confrontation, via rivalry, to partnership. It seems to me that if we can stick to this course, if we can catch the moods of our peoples, and I, with all my commitments, have attempted to find at least some opportunities for brief meetings simply to meet people, simply to look them in the eye and to sense things...[sentence unfinished as heard]

You can see this from yesterday and today—I would say the Americans are also worried about the future, and understand that much depends on how relations between our countries will develop. That's a good thing, because our people also want that. The latest polls in our country and in America show that people want changes for the better. That is what we are now reflecting in politics—still far from completely, I think. The politicians have got to take this on board and understand, take courage and show will and farsightedness; then we'll be able to say that in the end, and if things go that way, well, we can speak in the future of cooperation and friendship between these peoples.

I personally see all this as possible Once we started saying let us start a struggle for a nonviolent nonnuclear world, they said it was yet another utopia, an illusion. See where we are now. Yet only four years have passed. It was said on 15 January 1986, and we've already got...[pauses] are getting to the point of achieving a 50 percent reduction, and not just on conventional arms, or chemical weapons either. I think the world has begun to change for the better. There is a common responsibility, and above all for such nations as our nations. Our two great nations, our powerful states, bear a unique responsibility.

Partnership, I think, is the closest prospect. The closest prospect. Although, you see, it is all happening in the course of a very complicated struggle. A complicated struggle. Even today's meeting. You know what a dramatic course it took. You felt this morning...

[Shevardnadze interrupts] Till the last moment.

[Gorbachev] Till the last moment. I was here, and Eduard Amvrosiyevich was telephoning to get agreement on the final versions of how to resolve that dramatic situation.

[Polzikov] That related mainly to the trade and economic agreement.

[Gorabchev] Not only. But still there is [pauses]...the trade agreement was ready. Well, I don't want now to [pauses]...let the mechanism remain [laughs] as it were, working it out and wrangling, that is behind the scenes. Yes, but that it has ended with such results, I rate that very highly. It's what we need, what the Americans need, and what the world needs.

[Polzikov] Thank you very much. Eduard Amvrosiyevich, I know how hard your department has been working recently, and today—working flat out. It's difficult as yet, I suppose, to sum it all up, there is still a lot that needs to be smoothed out; but this really has been dramatic and difficult.

[Shevardnadze] Yes, its difficult for me to add anything to what Mikhail Sergeyevich has said. Yes, indeed, there were complicated situations, very complex. Today we can talk about partnership. We can definitely talk about partnership, because the decisions themselves which have been made and the agreements which our party, our state and our leadership have taken, and the principles of the new political thinking, are working. Hence, on this basis, appears this prospect of building relations on principles of partnership. These principles have helped us to come to major decisions.

I don't know about Mikhail Sergeyevich, I suppose the future will decide, I consider that the Washington summit is a major event in world politics.

[Gorbachev] Yes, perhaps. I don't know. This event can perhaps be equated with when the anti-Hitlerite coalition was formed, when they overcame everything and set up a united front in the fight against fascism, against this force which threatened civilization. Then they forgot all their ideological differences and other things and, notwithstanding, entered into cooperation. I must say that the degree of such cooperation of such scale and such importance is not less.

You see, we are talking of a 50 percent cut of strategic nuclear weapons. This, really, per se, is tremendous. And if we add to this that here there is also a trade agreement-...[sentence unfinished as heard] For ten years, for tens of years, we could not come close to one. If we add to this a whole complex regarding chemical weapons, nuclear tests, regarding other problems concerning...

[Shevardnadze, interrupting] Science.

[Gorbachev] ...science, technology, maritime transport, then this makes up a whole complex of very major problems. Therefore, this is a major event. And further, I will tell you more, that even all this, if it is enumerated—then, these are always a sort of quantitative measurement. This is never everything. The fact that this summit is taking place at this moment, at the dynamic moment of profound changes in the world, and is taking place successfully, that agreement and trust are being strengthened, is a demonstration of the new thinking and new approaches. Cooperation is of fundamental importance, really, for all international relations.

[Polzikov] [Words indistinct] that process of domestic policy which is taking place in the Soviet Union.

[Gorbachev] Indeed, I think that today, and yesterday, and the day before yesterday, there were many conversations on this, and I must say that we here in Washington (?have seen) in the face of the President, and the secretary of state and other participants of the delegation, and also in the face of ordinary people, Americans, that they all want us to reach the goals set by perestroyka. They realize it is practically as necessary for them as for us. This, I would have said, is the key aspect.

[Polzikov] You managed to feel this at all levels?

[Gorbachev] Yes. I felt this. Although, there is not such a 100 percent, perhaps, global unanimity and agreement and evaluation in American society. But all the same, on the whole, the basic influential forces of the political [pauses]...of the administration and of the public have made, I would say, such a choice. This is very important. This is very important in order for us to look with hope at the prospects for our relations, and in principle also at the prospects for the favorable development of international relations.

[Shevardnadze] What was happening on the streets...

[Polzikov interrupts] You saw that?

[Gorbachev] Yes, we saw it.

[Shevardnadze] Perhaps this says something about the fact that major changes are occurring in the consciousness of people...

[Polzikov interrupts] To recognize Americans from the way they were greeting our delegation, is something improbable...

[Gorbachev interrupts] Moreover, these are people who are, as it were, in general, spoiled. They have seen all sorts of things, but all the same they considered [pauses]... after all, brought them along. They came to say something. I have read so many hand-written wishes, opinions, appraisals, emotions, too. In general this is all very important.

[Polzikov] Thank you.

[Gobachev] I would like the Soviet people to see this because I think that it is important for them to know this.

Outcome Seen as 'Unusually Successful'

LD0206203590 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 2 Jun 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [Correspondent Yuriy Kobaladze] The leader of the USSR president's press service Arkadiy Maslennikov is giving an exclusive interview to the "Vremya" program. Arkadiy (?Afrikanovich), the last round of the talks between Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and George Bush will be held today. They will take place at Camp David, in private. What will the presidents discuss?

[Maslennikov] Strictly speaking, the official part of the talks ended yesterday, and the documents were also signed yesterday. The heads of the two states, Soviet and U.S., do nevertheless have something to discuss. The agenda was very full. They have had a great many of meetings. Nevertheless, not all the issues were discussed, of course. There are things that simply remained unresolved, that require further planning, or that require refinement in their approaches. Among these are certain matters relating to disarmament, first and foremost, matters relating to European development, the unification of Germany, its external aspects, a whole number of matters of bilateral relations, economic in particular. I think this will be both, simultaneously a summing up and the two presidents will, evidently, map out some kind of course for the future, refine their approaches, come to an agreement, evidently, on the program and nature of their work; the more so as there are to be two more meetings this year: One meeting will be devoted to signing a treaty on a 50-percent cut in strategic offensive weapons, and the second meeting will take place under the common European process, that is in the autumn this year. So, they do indeed have something to talk about.

[Kobaladze] Tell me, on the eve of the summit meeting there were many pessimistic forecasts in the mass media here. What do you think, have these forecasts been borne out, or not?

[Maslennikov] Well, I would say that not only here but throughout the world there was a lot of guessing. Our own mass media, newspapers, journals, and your television, reflected these tendencies in their coverage. Well, fortunately, I have to say that they, of course, were not borne out. The meeting turned out to be unusually productive, unusually successful. I would not be afraid to say this was the richest meeting in terms of content and results between our two countries' leaders.

[Kobaladze] Policies are made by people. How would you assess the two presidents' contributions to the achievement of such substantial accords?

[Maslennikov] Well, as you know, all sorts of personal praise are not fashionable with us at present, so to speak, but it would be simply unfair not to make note of the actual, personal contributions of the two presidents, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and George Bush, to the resolution of these difficult matters on the agenda. They have both shown enormous will, patience, statesmanlike wisdom, an ability to see things in perspective, in real perspective, in other words, with the breadth of vision characteristic of real statesmen. I would make particular note in this regard here, as we are now talking in Washington, of the role of President Bush, on whom gigantic pressure was exerted, both by the mass media and by interested political forces. He showed endurance, he showed will, boldness; in spite of this criticism he embarked on signing agreements that were not simple for him.

[Kobaladze] Thank you very much.

'Great Days in Washington' Viewed

PM0206210690 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 3 Jun 90 First Edition pp 1, 7

[Dispatch by own special correspondents V. Gan, T. Kolesnichenko, V. Linnik, and V. Sukhoy: "Great Days in Washington: M.S. Gorbachev Answers PRAVDA Correspondents' Questions"]

[Text] 2 Jun—The second day of the summit meeting—the meeting between the Soviet and American presidents—conclusively defined the broad scale, thoroughness, and international significance of these top-level talks.

M.S. Gorbachev gave his own particular assessment of the talks. Asked how the present summit meeting could be assessed, he answered not without humor: "Significant. Camp David tomorrow will show whether it will be highly significant. Camp David has more pure oxygen; it will help us think."

M.S. Gorbachev said a few words specially for PRAVDA readers during his meeting with U.S. Vice President Dan Quayle.

...Journalists had assembled in good time in the elegant, red velvet-trimmed reception room of the Soviet Embassy. There was the usual crush—the reporters were nervy, the security service likewise. Television cameramen were clambering on aluminum chairs, which they had prudently brought with them, to get a somewhat better view.

And then M.S. Gorbachev and Dan Quayle appeared.

"Mikhail Sergeyevich," we asked the Soviet President, "could you say a few words for PRAVDA readers: How are things going?"

Turning toward the vice president, M.S. Gorbachev said:

"PRAVDA here is asking how things are going. Things are going..."

"Things are going very well, with no problems," Dan Quayle chipped in.

"I would say frankly that things are going well, but I'd omit the phrase 'with no problems,'" the Soviet leader thought it necessary to add. "When there are no problems, we won't be needed. Nor will journalists," he joked.

"Indeed, our conversations are intensive. I cannot recall for a long time now such thoroughness in the study of every problem," M.S. Gorbachev continued. "And in the context of everything that is now happening in the world and in the light of the dynamics and deep changes. I consider that this is, as it were, the philosophical part, but it is very important. It is very important to understand correctly the role of the Soviet Union and the United States at such a time. The kind of policy and the kind of cooperation there will be hangs on this. In that sense, as I have already said, our discussion is taking place in a good atmosphere."

This is how M.S. Gorbachev rated the progress of the talks.

...Mary McClure, a woman of mature years who was sitting right on the edge of the sidewalk at the corner of 16th Street and M Street holding a placard with a slogan on it, was glad to talk to passersby and explain the reason for her vigil.

"The Soviet and U.S. Governments are doing quite a lot for their own peoples," she told us. "I support them in that respect. But they should pool their efforts to do even more. To remove the fear of war, hunger, disease, and disorder from our lives. That is why I decided to write this placard..."

Two hundred paces away from where Mary was holding her vigil, in the Soviet Embassy, this was precisely the topic of discussion. Receiving a large group of leading members of Congress, M.S. Gorbachev laid out his approach to developing effective Soviet-American collaboration and answered legislators' questions about the radical changes made possible as a result of the reforms of perestroyka.

The sides had something to talk about. The straightening out of Soviet-American relations and the altogether unprecedented dynamics given to those relations still do not mean an absence of problems, arguments, or contradictions This affects essentially the whole agenda of bilateral contacts. It is clear that by adopting a broad philosophical concept of mutual respect of interests the two countries can find solutions. In this sense the present meeting between the presidents can be seen as a kind of milestone in the establishment of constructive cooperation.

The participants in the meeting at the embassy expressed themselves in the same vein. George Mitchell, leader of the Democrat majority in the Senate, observed in conversation with us:

"At our meeting we discussed a wide range of questions, including the plans for reform of the Soviet economy, the situation in the Baltic and the Near East, and all aspects of European security. The exchange of opinions was very constructive, intensive, and fruitful. I believe that the members of parliament of both countries have a crucial role to play in agreements reached by the two sides."

Senator Alan Cranston added for his part that the "Soviet President was very frank and put forward certain proposals about how we could help in the present situation, for example, on questions of bilateral trade."

Robert Dole, leader of the Republican minority in the Senate, noted:

"We had a dialogue, and I think that we now understand Gorbachev's views better."

An important statement, since it is precisely from Congress and, in particular, its Republican minority that we never see understanding of our policy. Moreover, the inhabitants of Capitol Hill are not averse to exploiting the situation in the Soviet Union for their own narrow, selfish ends—for example, to win a few thousand votes from the ethnic minorities of the United States. Thus both in the press and in television speeches senators and congressmen have been maintaining that voters are putting "enormous pressure" on them over events in Lithuania. To be honest, they almost had us believing this: It's said to be a tough life for American legislators. But we took a good look at this. And what did we find? It turns out that, for example, according to public opinion polls, most Americans do not consider the Lithuanian problem an obstacle to developing and deepening Soviet-American dialogue. So this is rather a myth, grounds for political exploitation. All the references to the Congress' refusal to repeal the Jackson-Vanik amendment, which denies us the status of most-favored trading nation, and the "linkage" of the Lithuanian events with it are essentially a political maneuver.

And yet it is precisely mutual understanding which has been the distinguishing feature of the second day of the Washington summit. By 1700 hours "high-ranking officials," to use the language of diplomatic protocol, had assembled in the White House. There was the already familiar figure of Senator Robert Dole. Everyone took their seats in front of two rostrums. White House Press Secretary Marlin Fitzwater came up to one of them and announced:

"My apologies, gentlemen, but the ceremony is going to be delayed an hour."

And it has to be said that no one complained. Everyone appreciated what this meant—fresh complications had arisen at the last minute.

But then M.S. Gorbachev and George Bush did come into the room.

And we again asked M.S. Gorbachev to sum up the last 2 days.

"They have been two great days," he said. Difficult, tough, complicated days, as they are bound to be when the biggest issues, the largest states, the most major discussion, and decisions on the largest scale are involved."

[Question] "So did you achieve more than you expected?"

[Gorbachev] "I would not put it that way. We put a lot of effort into getting just these results. We were comparing our positions right until the last minute."

[Question] "So as a result the brunt of the work rested on the presidents' shoulders?"

[Gorbachev] "Yes, the presidents played the decisive role. It was this way: In the morning there were disagreements, but in the evening we found solutions. The personal scope, competence, and responsibility of the presidents all played their part. We labored to ensure the results were positive. And even more: We will be putting our contacts on an even more regular basis to remove the sensational element from them."

[Question] "And how did the conversations on European affairs go?"

[Gorbachev] "The exchange of opinions was very intensive and gave a boost to further progress, because Europe is the central, I would say, strategic point of world politics. Here, you won't get anything by rushing, as it were. We had to get to know each other well. Detailed arguments had to be resorted to."

[Question] "We have heard that the foreign ministers have been instructed to continue consultations. Is that so?"

[Gorbachev] "Yes, we have even agreed with President Bush to continue the exchange of opinions on problems of European security."

[Question] "And this is going to be talked about at Camp David tomorrow?"

[Gorbachev] "Yes, of course."

Arms Talks 'Completed Successfully'

LD0206094390 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0715 GMT 2 May 90

[By TASS military observer Vladimir Bogachev]

[Text] Moscow, 2 June (TASS)—USSR President Mikhail Gorbachev's state visit to the United States and his meetings with President George Bush have yielded inspiring results which undoubtedly will promote further progress toward a world without arms and wars.

For 65 years, since the 1925 Geneva protocol on banning the use of chemical weapons in warfare was signed, the issue of further measures for completely eliminating this dangerous and perfidious means of killing people has been discussed at various official and unofficial international forums. The talks on toxic combat substances, which lasted for many years, alternately brought hope and disappointment to the world community.

At one time the United States stopped producing chemical armaments, whereas the Soviet Union did not follow its example. Then the countries swapped roles. The USSR stopped the production line for poison gas, whereas the United States started producing new, in principle, binary arms. Now, however, such zigzags in the sphere of chemical arms production seem to have reached an end. The two presidents have reached an agreement on both countries discontinuing the production of combat poisoning substances. The accord stipulates that each side should reduce at the first stage the stockpiles of chemical weapons by 80 percent.

This is not yet a full ban on one of the most disgusting means of mass killing. The Washington bilateral accord, however, is the first important step toward outlawing this weapon by all the world states. No doubt, it will impart a new impulse to the talks on chemical weapons at the Geneva disarmament conference, speed up the process of harmonizing a convention on fully eliminating the threat of chemical war in people's life.

Sixteen years have passed since the signing of the treaty between the USSR and the United States on limiting undergound nuclear weapons tests and 14 since the conclusion of the Soviet-U.S. treaty on underground nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes. However, the U.S. Senate has refused to ratify these agreements so far. Now is not the time for making a critical assessment of these actions by Washington. Protocols to the Soviet-U.S. treaties of 1974 and 1976 have been agreed and signed in the U.S. capital, envisaging "unprecedented improvements" in the procedures for verifying their observance. This opens up the path to ratification of the treaties by both countries' legislators.

Unfortunately, the prospects for a total ban on nuclear weapons tests are much less encouraging than the prospects for the total elimination of chemical weapons. The Americans still do not wish to stop all nuclear explosions, at least in the foreseeable future. However, we live in a rapidly changing world. Let us hope that the American side will ultimately move toward the demands of world public opinion in the field of nuclear tests as well.

As secretary of State James Baker has noted, the summit meeting has helped to reduce differences in the sides' positions regarding conventional weapons in Europe. The sides have pointed to their determination to achieve the conclusion of that agreement this year.

The two presidents have signed a joint statement laying down the main agreed provisions of the future treaty on reducing strategic offensive weapons, although until the last minute journalists were expressing doubts as to the possibility of that document being adopted. The sides have agreed, in particular, not to produce or deploy MIRVed sea-launched cruise missiles. It should be recalled that problems of strategic naval weapons have for many years remained a stumbling block at the Geneva negotiations, and still are. Mutually acceptable solutions have been found during the summit meeting on a number of disputed issues. Many provisions of the future treaty on strategic offensive weapons are still not agreed upon. However, the presidents of the two countries have decided to give instructions to their delegations at the Geneva negotiations to accelerate work and prepare the treaty on strategic offensive weapons for signing at the end of this year.

It would not be an exaggeration to say that the talks between Mikhail Gorbachev and George Bush on disarmament problems have been completed successfully.

Bush Speaks at Document Signing

PM0406104790 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
3 Jun 90 Second Edition pp 1, 5

[TASS report: "Signing of Soviet-American Documents"]

[Excerpts] Washington, 2 Jun—The ceremony of signing Soviet-American documents took place at the White House Friday evening. Members of the U.S. cabinet, Congressional leaders, the Soviet delegation, and numerous journalists were present.

George Bush and M.S. Gorbachev spoke at the ceremony.

Speech by U.S. President George Bush

President Gorbachev, I welcome you again to the White House.

Mr. President, six months ago, on the seaboard of the island state of Malta, you and I planned our course. And at the same time we agreed the agenda, a considerable part of which was fulfilled by our summit meeting this week. Our Malta agenda is, of course, far from being exhausted, but in the last six months and over the last two days we have made considerable progress.

We are about to sign agreements concerning many spheres of vitally important interest for our countries and the whole world and to enshrine our mutual understanding on specific questions in joint statements which will be issued today.

First, we will sign a bilateral agreement which will make it possible for the first time to eliminate the overwhelming majority of the chemical weapons which our countries have stockpiled over many years. And may this epoch-making agreement quickly bring about a global ban on chemical weapons.

Second, we will sign proocols on the limitation of nuclear tests. After prolonged, sometimes tense negotiations we reached agreement upon an unprecedented improvement in on-site monitoring of the fulfillment of the "threshold" treaty banning nuclear tests and of the treaty on nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes.

Third, we will sign a new important agreement which will supplement and expand the 1973 agreement on the use of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes. This new agreement envisages extensive American-Soviet cooperation in the sphere of research connected with nuclear energy and ensuring the safety of civil nuclear facilities.

Moreover, President Gorbachev and I will make a joint statement laying out the basic agreed provisions of the treaty on strategic arms reductin and also a joint statement in which we will give our assent to the holding in the future of talks on nuclear and space arms with the aim of consolidating stability and reducing the danger of war.

We will also issue a statement on conventional armed forces in Europe in which we will give a commitment to accelerating the pace of the Vienna talks and achieving a speedy agreement on all unresolved questions. As you can see, we unanimously consider the treaty on conventional forces in Europe to be an essential foundation for future European security.

During this meeting the United States will sign or announce many other agreements—agreements embodying the intensive work and abiding achievements of not just our governments but the peoples of our countries too.

For example, the agreement creating an American-Soviet park in the Bering Strait [area]. This park will represent the unique natural and cultural legacy of Alaska and Siberia in the Bering Sea area so that a bridge of friendship will span the water, uniting our two peoples in a spirit of peaceful cooperation like the land bridge which once joined our two continents.

In this spirit that Mr. Gorbachev and I will sign an agreement realizing the goal we set ourselves on Malta of expanding student exhange—1,000 from each side. This will make it possible for an even larger number of young people to gain personal knowledge of the culture and politics of our countries and live in friendship. And out of ordinary friendship ultimately arises deep conviction: The people of the world have far more that unites them than divides them.

In just a few minutes Secretary of State Baker and Foreign Minister Shevardnadze will also sign four new important agreements concerning maritime borders, ocean research, civil aviation, and a long-term agreement on grain deliveries.

Minister Shevardnadze and Secretary of Transportation Skinner will sign a fifth agreement on maritime transport. And President Gorbachev and I will also sign an agreement on trade while impatiently awaiting the adoption of a Soviet law on emigration.

President Gorbachev, I am very pleased with what we have achieved during these days and am fully resolved to continue building on this sound foundation. The agreement which we sign today and those agreements which will appear later are advancing the cause of peace. These agreements are in the best interests of our countries and all countries of the world.

Not so long ago some people considered that the burden of history had condemned our two great countries and our two great peoples to constant confrontation. Yes, we have to throw down challenges to history, make new efforts, and establish durable relations of cooperation.

We may not agree on everything, and indeed we do not. Yet we do believe in one great truth, a truth which the world has so long waited for—the cold war must end. Therefore I say today with gratitude in my heart to all the representatives of the Soviet side and the United States who worked so intensively at all levels to make sure these agreements assumed their final shape: Let us repeat our promise and build a world in which there will be greater peace. [applause]. [passage omitted]

M.S. Gorbachev and George Bush signed the following documents:

—an agreement on trade;
—an agreement on the destruction and nonproduction of chemical weapons;
—a protocol to the nuclear test treaty;
—a protocol to the treaty on nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes;
—an agreement on cooperation in the sphere of the use of nuclear energy;
—an agreement on student exchanges;

The following joint statements were issued on behalf of the two presidents:

—on the basic provisions of the future treaty on a 50-percent reduction of strategic offensive arms;
—on the next stage of talks on strategic offensive arms;
—on the conventional arms talks in Vienna;
—on the "Beringia" international park.

In the presence of the presidents the following were signed at ministerial level:

—an agreement on the demarcation of maritime space;
—an agreement on the study of the world's oceans;
—an agreement on civil aviation;
—an agreement on maritime shipping;
—a grain agreement.

The documents were signed on the Soviet side by E.A. Shevardnadze and on the American side by James Baker and other leaders of U.S. Government departments.

Officials Welcome Agreements

LD0306002190 Moscow TASS in English 2324 GMT 2 Jun 90

[By TASS special correspondents Vitaliy Chukseyev and Aleksandr Korolev]

[Text] Washington June 3 TASS—Soviet-American agreements were signed at the U.S. State Department on Saturday on establishing culture and information centres of the two countries in Washington and Moscow, on cooperation between customs services and increasing the circulation of the government magazines Soviet Life and America.

Under the accords signed within the framework of Mikhail Gorbachev's state visit to the United States, the sides will open their culture and information centres in their respective capitals in order to provide more diverse information for American and Soviet people about life in the two countries.

In addition, the accords envisage broader interaction between the Soviet and American customs services, especially in curbing drug trafficking.

The circulation of the monthlies Soviet Life and America, published on a parity basis in the United States and the Soviet Union, will grow considerably.

The agreements signed at the Soviet Embassy by representatives of the American business community and several Soviet ministries marked another important step towards broader mutually beneficial cooperation.

The two sides signed an agreement on broadening cooperation between the Soviet foreign economic and American trade consortia, including accords on setting up a joint venture with Chevron to develop Kazakhstan's Tengiz oil and gas field and on the delivery of 13,000 personal computers to Soviet schools by IBM World Trade.

Richard Matzke, president of Chevron Overseas Petroleum, said the documents are designed to deepen trade and economic cooperation between the two superpowers.

Yuriy Maslyukov, member of the Soviet Presidential Council, described the accords as "very important and promising".

"Today's project can be justly described as project No. 1 among all the major ventures we are going to undertake together with the American side," he said.

"The project will form a solid basis for the further development of business relations between the USSR and the United States and facilitate the USSR's integration into the world economy."

Dwelling on the implementation of the joint Soviet-American programme for the introduction of information technology in schools, Michael Armstrong, president of the IBM World Trade Corporation, praised the qualification of Soviet specialists.

"We are going to study together with them and from them. We believe that our cooperation will be lengthy and successful."

Yuriy Ryzhov, chairman of the Soviet parliamentary committee for science, public education and culture, said:

"The signing of the documents became possible thanks to the transition to long-term and firm cooperation proclaimed by the leaders of our two countries.

"These accords give a fresh impetus not only to the development of relations between our countries, but also to the perfection of the USSR's education system."

All this is extremely important at the current crucial stage of world development when a global information and communications system is being created, he said.

IBM, Chevron Agreements Viewed

LD0406151090 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1430 GMT 3 Jun 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [Correspondent Tkakchenko] More than 13,000 personal computers from the leading American company IBM will soon end up in Soviet schools. An agreement on this was signed on Saturday at the USSR Embassy in Washington. Under the agreement, training of Soviet teachers and specialists will also be carried out for servicing the equipment. The initiative for this program originates from the USSR Supreme Soviet Committee for Science, Public Education, Culture, and Upbringing. in the view of its chairman, Yuriy Ryzhov, computer literacy is the third inevitable stage in the development of civilization after the invention of writing and printing.

Apart from this, an agreement was signed between the major American oil refining company Chevron and the USSR Ministry of the Oil and Gas Industry; it provides for the creation of a joint enterprise for developing the oil field of Tengiz, in the northeastern region of the Caspian Sea in Kazakhstan. This is the largest oilfield in the world to be discovered over the last 10 years. The president of the Chevron Company, Richard Mutskie, noted that the joint venture would use ecologically clean technologies, and ensure good working conditions for the hundreds of Soviet people and Americans. [video shows signing ceremonies, cutting to following interview with Shatalin, member of USSR Presidential Council]

[Shatalin] Our two countries are taking the road of a serious economic dialogue, which is already being underpinned by real steps. I can say the same about the oil project, and about the project, the signing of the contract with IBM, and in particular, the oil project is a very large joint venture, and I think that this is the beginning of a new stage with regard to foreign investment in our industry, in our national economy, and I think that this is a very true and correct path, for I have been putting my point of view for a long time that, without large scale cooperation with the West, we will not solve our economic problems.

Gorbachev Arrives at Camp David

LD0206162390 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1540 GMT 2 Jun 90

[Text] Washington, 2 June (TASS)—TASS special correspondents report:

The president of the USSR will spend today, the third working day of his visit to the United States, at Camp David, the country residence of the U.S. President. No official activities are planned here. As George Bush put it, the first day of June has already brought the peoples hope that one day all people will not only lay down their arms, but will also stretch out a hand to each other.

George Bush and Mikhail Gorbachev have almost two more days ahead of them and the U.S. papers today are saying that the unofficial part of the visit, the closer contact between the presidents, free of protocol, should give the dialogue between the leaders of the two great powers a personal dimension.

Helicopters brought Mikhail Gorbachev and George Bush to Camp David. After a short welcoming ceremony—a parade by the marines—Mikhail Gorbachev and Raisa Gorbacheva climbed into electric cars driven by George Bush and Barbara Bush and headed for 'Laurel,' the house where the conversations between the Soviet and U.S. leaders will continue in an informal atmosphere. A house called 'Birth Tree' has been provided to accommodate the USSR president and his wife.

Summit Briefing by Fitzwater

LD0206230190 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 2210 GMT 2 Jun 90

[By TASS correspondents Igor Borisenko and Oleg Polyakovskiy]

[Text] Washington, 3 Jun (TASS)—M.S. Gorbachev and G. Bush discussed a wide range of problems of international security, primarily regional issues, during their stay at the U.S. presidential country residence at Camp David, where the Soviet-U.S. summit continued yesterday. That was the announcement made at a briefing at the international press center in Camp Round Meadow (Maryland State), near Camp David, by Marlin Fitzwater, the White House press secretary.

"The talks centered on Afghanistan, Cambodia, Cuba, Nicaragua, El Salvador, India, Pakistan, and the Near East. Taking part in the conversations were J. Baker, secretary of state; B. Scowcroft, the president's national security adviser; E.A. Shevardnadze, the foreign minister; and Marshal S.F. Akhromeyev, the USSR president's aide," noted M. Fitzwater. In their discussion of regional problems, he said: "Presidents Bush and Gorbachev agreed that they must cooperate in order to reduce tension where possible. They set out their positions and opinions regarding seeking a solution to regional problems." Both leaders, said the White House press secretary, agreed to continue discussion of these problems. G. Bush, he stressed, spoke highly of M.S. Gorbachev's policy in the sphere of building an open society in the USSR. "The two presidents discussed problems of anti-Semitism and agreed to oppose prejudice and any manifestations of anti-Semitism. They also discussed issues concerning emigration from the Soviet Union to Israel, the United States, and other countries," announced Fitzwater.

"I think," he continued, "that both leaders are completely satisfied with their conversations." Answering a question, he said that Lithuania had not been discussed at Camp David. Replying to another question, Fitzwater stressed that the discussion at Camp David had been very productive and had led to improved mutual understanding which, in turn, may lead to a rapprochement of positions on several issues.

Gorbachev Comments After Camp David

LD0306152590 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1340 GMT 3 Jun 90

[Interview with USSR President Mikhail Gorbachev by Valentin Zorin "for Moscow Television" on 2 June; place not given—recorded]

[Text] [Zorin] Mikhail Sergeyvich, our conversation is taking place immediately after your conversations with the President at Camp David, and this, understandably, has evoked great interest: Two presidents withdraw from the gaze of outsiders for a whole day and conduct talks. There are more than 5,000 journalists here so there is a great deal of conjecturing. Could you tell our viewers what you can, albeit in brief?

[Gorbachev] I would say that what has taken place today at Camp David is what I would call a great day, which in its results and in what was discussed there—and moreover discussed thoroughly and comprehensively - is not inferior to what was done in the days before, to what has been implemented, or to what has found an expression in the agreements that have been signed. Why do I say this? Well, above all I have to say that Camp David has permitted us to discuss many isues of both bilateral relations and international politics in an open [otrkytiy], free, and relaxed atmosphere without superfluous witnesses, so to speak. You know, if I were to start enumerating everything, it would take a long time, and perhaps the point is not so much in that but in something else, in the fact that possibilities have been revealed, new possibilities of interaction and cooperation in tackling many international problems. Of course, I would be wrong—it would be an exaggeration on my part—if I were to say that we agreed on everything, and that we had discovered a complete coincidence of views on all the problems. No, and I think that it is quite natural for these two vast states to have differences of interests, including their approaches to solving this or that problem. All the same, I think our watches have been synchronized after a fashion, the political watches.

And as a result of this, very promising possibilities have opened up for interaction. I think that our peoples, both the American and Soviet people, should know this, and others should know it too, because what happens in Soviet-American relations always reaches far beyond the confines of bilateral relations and is of immense importance. I probably do not need to lay any kind of stress on that here, for it goes without saying. That is the first thing. I think that the next few months will show already that the time which was devoted to examining problems at Camp David was not wasted, but will yield results.

The second thing. I think that after Camp David I can speak of qualitatively new relations which have been established between the leaders of our countries. I rate very highly the fact that our dialogue with U.S. President George Bush developed actively and grew deeper all the time, and more and more elements of trust and cooperation appeared in it. Camp David is already a different phase and a different atmosphere, an atmosphere in my view that in general, is in its own right and independently an important factor for promoting further progress in our relations.

[Zorin] Of course, I get the impression from what you are saying that there is still much to think about and analyze here. All the same, what about your first instinct: What was the most important thing during these days?

[Gorbachev] You are right that we still have to think, and I am thinking about what I will say tomorrow at the news conference which we are going to give together. I do not want to anticipate what I will say tomorrow, but nonetheless I would like to try to say a few words about the main points. You have asked a good question. You know, what I would say is this: The main thing is that the meeting has taken place and has been a success, and real results have been achieved. This meeting has taken place at a time of profound changes in all of world politics, in all areas, and especially in the continent of Europe, and in our relations with the United States—at a time of the most cardinal, fundamental changes in our society. It occurred to me yesterday, and I said when we signed—were signing—the documents, that if Malta had not been, and the very substantial dialogue and the first personal contact between the two leaders, although Mr. Bush and I had met previously, I think it would have been more difficult for us to live through these months since November and December, as they've been full of very dramatic changes. And yet in these months, in these days of abrupt change, both our states, both governments acted responsibly. So now, this factor of interaction in the context of the deep changes that are taking place in the world, when we all want our hopes to be justified—of a better world and greater stability in international relations, of cooperation, that the process of disarmament will gather strength and bear fruit, and that resources will be released for solving social problems, which would improve people's lives. [sentence as heard] If we then regard this meeting from that point of view, I see that its result is precisely that it imparts stability to those positive processes and changes in international politics.

[Zorin] Mikhail Sergeyevich, before your visit here, there was a very large amount of discussion in the press and in political circles here about the difficult situation our country finds itself in and the impact this was going to have at the talks that you had ahead of you. What were things really like in the course of the talks?

[Gorbachev] Well, the fact is that we in our country really have now reached a point, have entered a stage and phase of the development of restructuring, in which we are now genuinely tackling what are perhaps the most important and fundamental tasks. This concerns both the political process, and the life of our federation, and this particularly concerns our economy. We are in point of fact definitively breaking with everything associated with the protracted existence of the administrative-command system. It permeated all spheres of life in our society. And we are embarking on a path of getting to grips with new forms of life, in all spheres of the life of society, and above all in a decisive area such as the economy. After all, we are making a shift in the direction of the market. And this will change everything very seriously, placing our people, our production collectives, and the whole of society in a new situation. So naturally—and this is for quite understandable reasons; after all, it affects our fate, and that of our children and grandchildren—we all are discussing all these matters in a very responsible, impassioned and sharp manner. I think that all this is justified. Some people attempt to say that this is all proceeding very turbulently, but I think that such issues, which are determining our life today—what it is to be like—and tomorrow, and for whole decades ahead, should be discussed in this very manner.

It is another matter that there are cases of speculation, there are elements of bewilderment, because all this is very unwanted, and people get used to things, they establish a certain way of life—in everyday life, in society, in the production sphere, in the political sphere, and in human relations. All this is undergoing profound changes, and people are upset and worried. I think we must go through that. Once we have decided that we cannot live like this, that it is impossible to live like this any longer, that we must change everything for the better, so that our people have a sense of well-being in their country, we must pass through that with courage, tackle it responsibly, and not fall into extremes. And not pay any attention to all kinds of speculations and speculative appeals. It is always very difficult to make progress on the main front. It's easier to lob questions from one side or the other. But, to move the process of change in a real way is the most difficult thing. I think it is being more—more and more—understood that this is the main thing now; not meetings, and shouting, and noise, and uproar, and declarations, and promises, but realizing this policy of ours. I am saying all this because we who are living there, and acting, and know the whole of society better and see it all, are anxious and worried.

But, this is worldwide, because what is happening in our country is of course, above all, what we need, need very badly. But, the whole world needs it. For as a result of this, the whole country and the whole of our society is turning about, as it were, and becoming open to the whole world. This, you know, people see this. And in the first place, I don't feel myself to be...

[Unidentified speaker, apparently prompting] In a difficult position.

[Gorbachev] In a difficult position, and I know who I represent and what country I represent, and I know our possibilities. And, by the way, I have sensed that here too, the people are well aware of who is standing before them. And we've had very responsible, open, substantial, respectful, and equal talks, and they have ended with such results. And I think neither the President of the United States nor the president of the Soviet Union will allow anyone to try to dictate to them. That is in any case unacceptable, and moreover, each of them has behind him a vast country, a vast world, and therefore a vast responsibility.

Everything took place in a very good atmosphere and perhaps, it is perhaps the first time with the leaders of the United States of America—and there have already been many meetings—that I have been able to discuss all the problems so profoundly and thoroughly. The work was solid. I like it when much that is useful and necessary is done at meetings. It has, moreover, been crucial work and I believe it has been concluded with great results and these results promise further progress in our relations.

[Zorin] Many thanks for this interview, and I hope that the remainder of your trip will also produce no shortage of results. Thank you.

[Gorbachev] Yes. You know I should say thank you for what you have said, but I would just like to add that I found the Americans well-disposed toward us. They are much concerned for what we are doing. No doubt you have managed to convey this in some way. I deliberately, as much as I could, tried to come into direct contact in the most relaxed atmosphere—that was with the people in the streets—and if we add to that that Raisa Maximovna went off to Boston with Mrs. Bush to meet young people and has shared her impressions with me—and this was shown to the whole of America—I have to say that all these contacts have allowed me to become convinced that here in America we are gaining more and more supporters and friends. People are concerned for our affairs, for perestroyka, and wish us success. I have to say that they support their President, who is constructively cooperating with the Soviet Union and the Soviet leadership. I therefore think that the days ahead will add impressions and that there will be other chances to share them later on and to tell our people about this trip in general once I return.

[Zorin] Don't forget that desire. We'll remind you of it.

[Gorbachev] Okay.

[Zorin] Thank you very much, Mikhail Sergeyevich.

[Gorbachev] All the best.

Gorbachev Values 'Personal Rapport'

LD0306223990 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 3 Jun 90

[Remarks by USSR President Mikhail Gorbachev to journalists at Camp David in Washington on 3 June—recorded; from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Excerpt] [passage omitted]

[Gorbachev] [video shows Gorbachev alighting from golf cart and talking to journalists in the open air at Camp David] I rate today's talks with the President no less high than yesterday's talks and those the day before yesterday, over the past two days. We worked very fruitfully, and I think that without this day it would have been a different visit. Today's discussions enabled me, they enable me to tell you, with full responsibility and after careful thought, at least two things: There are huge opportunities for cooperation, despite the fact that there are real problems and that the President and I did not turn a blind eye to them. I value very highly the personal cooperation—rapport that is taking shape between me and the President of the United States. We shoulder great responsibility for our peoples and other peoples, but the fact that such a relationship has taken shape between us enables us to get down to all the problems more quickly, to develop our argumentation and reach a certain balance.

[Unidentified man, in English with superimposed Russian translation] But will you reassess your position on Germany? Was it the subject of your talks?

[Gorbachev] Yes, it was, and the President and I are planning to mention that tomorrow. We continued our discussion of that question, too. But there is one point we must bear in mind. For all the importance of our positions, our responsibility, we must remember that we are all part of this process. There is also the six, the two-plus-four. There are the interests of the European states. And I think the President and I took that into account. It has been a big day. [passage omitted]

Trade Treaty Ratification Viewed

PM0306175590 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 3 Jun 90 Morning Edition p 1

[Dispatch by own special correspondent S. Kondrashov: "Matching up to the People's Expectations: The First Fruits"]

[Text] Washington—Every summit consists, as it were, of two parts: the formal enactment of documents prepared in advance, which have been stimulated by previous meetings, and new breakthroughs. The first part came to an end on Friday night-Saturday Moscow time (1900 hours Washington), with the signing of more than a dozen agreements.

It constituted the most significant act hitherto in the translation into deeds of the talk about the end of the cold war, of which there has been a very great deal of late. What we have here is a success, but it cannot be said that its birth was easy or that its practical dimensions are very great.

Since Malta great hopes have been pinned on the signing of a trade agreement in Washington. And it was signed, although uncertainty persisted until the last moment. Bush in his vacillation over this referred to the Lithuanian question. Gorbachev reportedly stressed in his conversations with him the baleful political impact of a failure to sign the agreement. The Soviet President did manage to persuade the American President, but how assiduous will the latter be in his attempts to persuade Congress? It is reported that, having signed the agreement, the Bush administration does not intend to submit it for ratification.

Shevardnadze and Baker were in session until the very last moment before the signing ceremony, settling the details of the joint declaration on the Treaty on Strategic Offensive Armaments. The Americans had in their usual way stiffened their positions, particularly concerning the computation of Soviet "Backfire" bombers. The treaty, which is still described as a treaty on a 50-percent cut in strategic nuclear arms, has become after eight years of labor a treaty making a roughly 30-percent cut. But now its framework has at last been defined, the goal has been set that our two countries' top leaders sign it by the end of the year, and the promise made that the elaboration of a more thoroughgoing [glubokiy] treaty will be embarked on forthwith.

The chemical weapons agreement is radical in nature. They are less destructive than nuclear weapons, but no less lethal. The elimination of virtually all the "chemicals" will be phased over 12 years. The Americans did not abandon production of binary weapons without resistance. In the Soviet Union, where quite enough chemical weapons have been produced, we are now short of appropriate facilities for destroying them.

Under the agreement on maritime shipping we are opening up 42 ports to each other. Flights between Moscow, New York, and Washington are being increased and, moreover, a further six airports are being opened to the two countries' airlines. The improvements in the air and on the sea make me think about "detente mark one," in the the first half of the seventies, when similar agreements, albeit not of such scope, took place—agreements which subsequently ceased to operate because of the resumption of the cold war.

But there is a new agreement which was inconceivable before: The annual exchange of 1,000 students each. This, like other such exchanges, is backed up by a fundamental shift which gives grounds for hoping that the retrogression will not be repeated, because the peoples themselves and not just those in elected office—whose concern it previously was—are participating in this movement. No matter how far from perfection our glasnost may be, we have in recent years revealed our country—with its difficult history and present misfortunes—to the whole world, including America. The latter reveals itself to us in receiving our students and they, let us hope, are not now menaced by persecution for understanding America "the wrong way" or taking in American ideas.

The Americans tried to put human rights into previous summit meetings, but we refused to discuss them. This time Gorbachev and Bush virtually did not touch on this topic. There are disagreements, but they have ceased to be the subject of fierce dispute. Political freedoms, democratic methods of government, and the sovereignty of the individual—these ideas are being introduced into perestroyka and, once they have struck root, will form the most solid foundation for our new, normal, and predictable relations with the West.

I was witness at the Soviet Embassy to a ceremony unimaginable five or even three years ago. The USSR President was awarded the Franklin Delano Roosevelt Medal of Freedom. The Roosevelt family was represented by a granddaughter and a great-granddaughter. The patriarchs of liberal America were gathered there. At the sight of 90-year-old Senator Fulbright, who was being led in on the arm of the legendary television commentator, Walter Cronkite, also of venerable age, I thought to myself: Here comes, leaning on his stick, a living representative of the history of America whom I had occasion to observe some 30 years ago. The America that is politically sophisticated, but is rational and enlightened, ready to appreciate the drive for human freedom and humanity throughout the world. There was Mansfield, former Senate majority leader, and Clifford, former adviser to many presidents and secretary of defense. There were also other political patriarchs who had advocated decent relations with us before but who had come to the Soviet Embassy for the first time to welcome the man who had changed their ideas about the Soviet Union.

In justifying the award of the Medal of Freedom speakers heaped such praise on Gorbachev that he jokingly said that this was all certainly being said about someone else. But it was nevertheless said of him. And yet in his own country, our country, this man is beset with problems and crises, and their number is constantly growing. But in America, although the previous enthusiastic sentiment has waned a little, the paradox, inconceivable for any Soviet leader in the past remains: namely, that the attitude toward him is more clearly positive than in his own country.

The ceremony described took place at 5 o'clock in the afternoon. In the morning the Soviet President's guests had been the leaders of Congress. They came not to make an award but to be keen listeners, to define their interlocutor not by the yardsticks of history but by the demands of the moment and the mood of their voters. To listen, but not to identify themeselves immediately with a particular position. They were most interested in our domestic issues and first-hand explanations about the plan to switch to a market economy. Senator Robert Dole's question expressed the bewilderment of an American political practitioner: Holding a referendum on questions of prices, he suggested, amounts to asking the people whether taxes should be raised—it is clear what the majority will say. That same Senator Dole, leader of the Republican minority in the Senate, after promising to be constructive, essentially made his assent to the trade agreement with the Soviet Union conditional on Moscow's recognizing Lithuania. Gorbachev has campaigned for the trade agreement, stressing the political significance of the act in encouraging the American business world to expand its ties with the Soviet Union. He managed to convince Bush of this, as it were, but the legislators seem to be sticking to their old opinion.

The official part of the visit comes to an end Sunday morning with a joint press conference by the two presidents in the White House. It remains to be seen what they will say about the results of their conversations on the German question. Americans have pinpointed it as the main new question to have arisen since the seismic shifts in East Europe. It is even more important for the Soviet Union: A European superpower, which is "intended" to become part of NATO, is arising alongside our borders. The balance between the the two blocs disappears as NATO becomes stronger through the inclusion of East Germany within its orbit, while the Warsaw Pact wanes. For all its outward politeness the Bush administration has to date shown no desire to understand how this offends against the interests of the Soviet Union and could fuel suspicion. The search for common ground will be an important test for Soviet-American relations in the post-cold war period.

Primakov Views 'Fruitful Summit'

LD0306160290 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1430 GMT 3 Jun 90

[Text] [V. Zorin] At the press center of the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting, a member of the Soviet delegation, Yevgeniy Maksimovich Primakov gave a briefing for representatives of the world press who are showing immense interest in what is happening.

[Begin Primakov recording] If one attempts to sum up some results of what has been done, I can share what are, naturally, my own personal impressions. I think that this is the most fruitful summit [preceding word said in English], or summit meeting in the history of our relations, both because it differs from others in the range of problems under discussion and on which agreements have been reached, and because it differs from others in the sense that it has, so to speak, a vertical dimension. We have taken a restrospective path and have cleared out of the way some of the things that obstructed our movement forwards. And, at the same time, the leaders of the two states have outlined issues on which there may be progress in the future. The situation was altogether favorable for solutions to be found, taking into account the interests of the world as a whole and the two states. I would also note one other dimension of this summit, of these results. In recent months, there have been rather a lot of issues commented on here by the press, and many questions have been asked by the public about what has been happening in the Soviet Union. Against this background, those successes which have been reached here demonstrate how firmly the processes of perestroyka are rooted in the Soviet Union, which are also affecting the development of the international situation, and to what extent these processes are already becoming irreversible. [end recording]

[Zorin] The hail of questions which then followed, asked by journalists present, many of world renown, gave Comrade Primakov the opportunity to touch on all the most important aspects of the talks. Even those journalists who had personally complained about the lack of information were this time, it would seem, fully satisfied. [video shows Primakov speaking at briefing, views of journalists in the hall.]

Gorbachev News Conference Statement

LD0306192690 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1407 GMT 3 Jun 90

[Statement by USSR President Mikhail Gorbachev at joint news conference with U.S. President George Bush at the White House—live]

[Text] Gentlemen, comrades. What has taken place in the last few days allows this summit to be described as an event of enormous significance for both bilateral relations and within the context of world politics. President Bush has here presented the results of the joint work that has been done and by that alone you may judge its scale, which is a confirmation of my own conclusions. I join President Bush, who has stressed at this meeting more than once, that we have effectively taken Malta as our starting point. It was precisely Malta that imparted dynamism to the process which is taking us toward the construction of completely new relations between the USSR and the United States, by overcoming the difficulties and divergencies of opinion that do exist, that we can see, and which we are not avoiding or evading. The whole atmosphere of this meeting and, of course, its results, allow us to talk about a transition to the truly new phase of cooperation of which Mr. President has spoken. I see the point of that transition in the fact that it is, on the one hand, derivative and, on the other, a factor of the profound changes affecting all countries. The constructive spirit of these days and the sense of responsibility with which any issue was discussed enabled us to succeed. This is very important, since a time when solutions to fundamental issues of contemporary civilization are on the agenda has a stabilizing effect on the entire international situation.

I do not wish here to make a detailed review on my own part of what we have taken into consideration, to compile a register, as it were, of what has been done, to name the agreements, the issues discussed, and the important statements which contain an undertaking for the future. I will, however, note the most substantial things. We have signed the basic provisions for a treaty to reduce strategic weapons, and I should like to stress that for the first time we are not just talking about limitations but about reductions of the most destructive means of war. I hope that by the end of the year we will reach a treaty.

We have signed a statement on future talks on nuclear and space weapons. We have agreed to act in such a way as definitely to conclude the Vienna talks and to reach an agreement on conventional arms so as to sign an agreement at the all-European summit at the end of this year. We have then agreed to act. This does not all depend on us, but at least this is what our position consists of.

We discussed problems connected with the European process at this meeting, and especially in connection with the external aspects of German unification. I cannot say that we reached agreement, but this does not mean that our efforts were futile.

Many new arguments and possible new outlooks appeared during the discussion; positions were clarified. Our position is that we are prepared to hold further discussions in search for a solution acceptable to all. We were unable to resolve this issue here in Washington, one to one with the President. There is the two-plus-four formula. There are other European states which are displaying great interest and are very concerned that a single, correct solution should be found which would satisfy all of us.

Our position, that of the Soviet Union, is that we want solutions to be found jointly which would become part of the general positive trend of changes in Europe and the world, strengthening security and not impairing or decreasing it. I should like to single out especially the one-day Camp David dialogue. It can be assessed as a new phase in strengthening mutual understanding and trust between us, the leaders of the two countries. Essentially, this dialogue embraced all world problems. There was a wide-ranging synchronizing of political watches. I should say that this whole day was marked by an atmosphere of constructive cooperation, frankness, directness in formulating questions and increasing trust. We devoted particular attention to examing such topical issues as the situation in the Near East, in Afghanistan, in southern Africa, in the Korean peninsula, Cambodia, and Central America. That is only part of what we discussed.

I cannot go into details here. Obviously, you will explain them. But I considered it necessary to stress and to single out in particular the Camp David dialogue. We agreed to make separate statements on Ethiopia. With the intention of rendering support to efforts to restore peace in that country, with the assistance of the United Nations, we agreed on humanitarian aid to the Ethiopian people.

Speaking strictly about bilateral issues, here, too, one can speak of achievements of, I would say, principled political significance. There is progress on a whole set of issues: agreements on trade and trading in grain; an agreement has been signed on cooperation in civil aviation, marine shipping, peaceful atomic energy, science and education. While the President and I were working and signing, and our ministers were signing, very important contacts were taking place alongside with many firms. They also reached very interesting decisions. The Chevron firm is joining in work to assimilate the Tengiz deposits, and this is linked to its investment of around ten billion rubles.

Our group of academics, including these here who have accompanied me, have conducted useful talks and have completed this with tne signing of a document of intent, from which it follows that this firm will participate in installing computer technology in the educational process in our country. This is very interesting cooperation in the humanitarian sphere. In general, I think that things connected with the economy and with other spheres of activity create a firm foundation for political dialogue and make it more reliable and sound; it has a reliable foundation.

I would like to express profound satisfaction at the joint work over the past days with George Bush, President of the United States. I value him highly as a man of state, capable of building dialogue with a high sense of political responsibility and seeking ways for accord. We have spent many hours together, and have had a foundation for getting to know each other better. I don't know when we might, each of us, be able to say that we know everything; obviously, this will never happen, we would have to occupy these posts too long; but nevertheless, much becomes clearer on the human plane, and this creates a good atmosphere in human terms. The President has said, and I confirm it, that we have spoken in favor of regular meetings, and with the accent on a working, business nature for these meetings. The time demands this, and this is what we will do.

I would like to announce that I have invited the President of the United States to make a state visit to the Soviet Union.

In conclusion—this is beyond the bounds of the talks, but it is within the framework of this visit, I cannot fail to say, and I would like this to be heard both by American and Soviet people, that we, the delegation of the Soviet Union, have had a very kind reception here, we have sensed feelings of sympathy, solidarity, and profound interest on the part of Americans in our affairs, what we are doing in the context of implementing the policy of perestroyka. I have sensed this frequently, both in brief contacts and in talks which we have had together here. I would like to thank the American citizens for this, and I assure them that they can count on reciprocity by the Soviet Union.

One last thing: We have spoken between the two of us, we have said what disturbs us, we have touched on various regions and problems, what affects in one way or another the lives of other countries, but that does not mean tnat we have been making decisions on their behalf. Nevertheless, we have always been mindful that what we are doing here will definitely be useful not just for us, our two countries and peoples, but also for the whole world, including, first and foremost, the countries of the enormous Third World. May I end my introductory statement at the press conference with this.

Bush-Gorbachev News Conference

LD0306195790 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1417 GMT 3 Jun 90

[News conference by President George Bush and USSR President Mikhail Gorbachev at the White House; President Bush, moderator, and non-Russian journalists speak in English with superimposed Russian translation—live]

[Text] [Moderator] The first question, (Terry Hunt).

[Hunt] The question is to both presidents, relating to Germany. President Bush (?has often expressed differences) in relation to the membership of a united Germany in NATO. To what extent have the previous divergences been resolved and are some or other alternative approaches being considered?

[Bush] I am not sure that we are at the essence of the divergences, but we understand them and understanding the position of President Gorbachev I may assure you that I have had every opportunity to explain in quite sufficient detail why I consider that a united Germany within the framework of NATO will play a stabilizing role and that it wil be important for guaranteeing stability in Europe after the unification of Germany. I am not sure that we are at the essence of the divergences, but the benefit of such meetings is that we have been able to speak openly, and I have no suspicions in relation to your position, his position, and I think that he has none in relation to mine. We are talking about taking collective decisions, together with our NATO allies but in the final analysis Germany itself must resolve this issue. Perhaps on account of (?rapprochement). I will hand over to President Gorbachev now.

[Gorbachev] Since, since I have expressed my opinion on this matter several times over the last few days, I will limit myself just to those remarks which I consider important in order to emphasize it, for your reflection and for a better understanding of what we want. We do not insist that the Soviet Union's option should be realized. We do not say that it should, without fail, be the option of the United States of America. Or someone else's option. We are speaking about an option for solving the general problems, the external problems in connection with the unification of Germany, an option which would organically form part and parcel of the European process and the improvement, in general, in international politics, so that this, the resolution of these issues, would help to strengthen and even enrich these processes and give them more reliability and stability. And we are against any option, whoever it may originate from, and we will ourselves not propose such an option which would weaken these processes, would create difficulties for the positive process on the European continent which is underway or which, as it were, would throw a spanner in the works. For this reason I consider the fact that I and the President and our colleagues devoted much attention to this issue, have thoroughly gone through our thoughts, I think that this is useful since we still have debates in front of us.

[Moderator] Newspaper PRAVDA.

[Unidentified PRAVDA journalist] Mikhail Sergeyevich, I have such a question myself. You have just mentioned the qualities of President Bush as a statesman. Please tell us what role they have played in the fact that you have succeeded at this summit, as we call it, in achieving so much and in making progress with so many problems which seemed insoluble [word indistinct].

[Gorbachev] Yes, I confirm what I have said and can add the following. I and President Bush became acquainted a little earlier, before we found ourselves in this situation together. And I felt already in the contacts during my visit here in 1987 that this was a man with whom it was possible to do business, that relations could be built up, and then the contacts on Governor's Island convinced me even more of this. We then exchanged correspondence, and Malta was perhaps the point where President Bush and I, having spent some time alone together, succeeded in getting to know one another very well and in discussing things. I think that everything began when it was revealed that President Bush and I both wished to conduct things in an informal manner, and this is very important. If one adds to this the fact that each of us, while remaining ourselves and representing our own peoples, must react to everything in a responsible fashion and if one takes into account the real role which the Soviet Union and America play, then you can imagine how important it is when there is some kind of human compatibility which allows these people to create an atmosphere which may permit the deeper reasons for some or other processes to be elucidated. I'd say that this dialogue has gone well, it seems, and Camp David yesterday was in itself a great achievement. That, at least, is how I see it, and I think that what has become established between us will be of great significance.

[Moderator] Helen Thomas, please.

[Thomas] This question has two parts and is addressed to both presidents. What guarantees can you give the Palestinians that the decision you have taken on immigration will not lead to further (?occupation) of their land, and why does Mr. Gorbachev have such sympathy for the Palestinians while President Bush is even vetoing UN participation in the (?conflict)?

[Gorbachev] Shall I start? Go ahead, please.

[Moderator] Did you want us to answer in a specific order?

[Bush] The U.S. policy on settlement in the occupied territories has not changed. It is clear. We are opposed to new settlements in the territories beyond the 1967 line. That is our policy, as has been reiterated on more than one occasion. We are not opposed to the secretary general sending an envoy to the Near East in order to study this important matter. The question becomes more complicated however when, a day before this is discussed, there is a scandalous attack on Israel from the territory of another country. This is not acceptable to us. Having said that, I should like to note that our position is that we do not feel there is a need for UN troops. We are in favor of Mr. Golding's going there, as a representative of the UN secretary general. When the issue arose, divergences of opinion also arose, as they have with many allies. I will say that we feel it is most desirable that rather than the representative of the UN secretary general, it should be a Security Council delegation that goes there.

[Thomas] In spite of the fact that it is clear that this is the old position?

[Bush] Quite right. There is settlement that does not correspondent to our policy. I am repeating our policy, and I should like to convince the Israeli Government of the fact that creating further settlements in these territories is not desirable. It is our objective to have the sides come to the negotiating table, and our secretary of state is diligently cooperating with the Israelis in this direction. I am also trying to convince them to begin dialogue. We believe it essential to take this step immediately and I intend in the future too to confirm America's policy and to insist on peace talks.

[Gorbachev] I have to answer. You have put the question very precisely as to what guarantees we are giving so that those who are leaving the Soviet Union and have chosen Israel as their place of residence are not settled in the occupied territories. It is not an easy question. Above all, I have to say that the Soviet Union is being subjected to very serious criticism in connection with this by the Arab countries. I have recently had meetings with President Asad of Syria and with Mubarak. These were very important talks. All the same, they touched upon this question too and as a matter of urgency. The question then of guarantees. A situation emerges where either, after this meeting and exchange of questions with the President of the United States on this matter, our concern will be heard in Israel and they will draw conclusions of some kind, or we must take thought to the extent of thinking what should be done about permission to leave. And it is possible that the question might arise, and it is precisely like this that the question is being raised in the Soviet Union, that while assurances on the part of Israel remain vague as to whether they will do this, departures and permission to do so should be postponed. Not revoking it, in theory, but postponing it for the moment. I think they should pay attention when two presidents advise them persistently to act sensibly. It is to this part that I wished to respond, perhaps.

[Kondratov] IZVESTIYA, (Kondratov). A question for Mikhail Sergeyevich. Mikhail Sergeyevich, your relations with President Bush work, and perestroyka is securely guaranteed from within. From outside, it has cooled. Even here, however, domestic issues and the situation at home worry us. For this reason, I should like to take the opportunity to ask you how you imagine relations with Yeltsin will develop. Do you think you will suggest a (?truce) to one another, so to speak?

[Gorbachev] I don't think you've picked the best place for explaining our domestic problems. [laughter] But such is life. There is real life. Processes are underway. They are taking place back home. It seems to me that I tried to react while I was in Canada. I was asked that question just after I had got out of the plane, and I said that I...I am worried most of all by a kind of impasse situation that took shape at the congress itself, because there is not such a strong advantage there, and three rounds were necessary for Comrade Yeltsin to acquire just several votes and manage to get elected. In other words, the situation remains, and I said that in the last few days something took place that merited everything being thought over. Comrade Yeltsin has changed his position on very important points, serious political, I would say, fundamental questions. At least he has introduced clarity, and I said that if it was not a political game in order to take up the post, then that was one thing, then from that there emerged one approach and one could forecast, so to speak, one type of development of events in the Supreme Soviet and in Russia. But if it is a maneuver and later on he returns to what he engaged in in recent years, to put it bluntly, not only critical —and I consider that section to be to a certain extent constructive, but also destructive, to a significant extent destructive. He did little to enrich our quest, within the framework of perestroyka, with new ideas and the more so with ideas regarding forms of life when we are drastically changing all, so to speak, fundamental...we are conducting fundamental changes in all spheres. If he returns to this again, his chairmanship will in general complicate all of these processes. I have to say—he gave an interview after that [his election] and people saw that he had begun again...had already turned in an incomprehensible direction, and immediately the next day they began to question him at the session. He tried to explain himself. To cut a long story short, I always say that life will put everything in its place.

At this moment, when we have reached a stage of decisive fundamental changes, when responsibility is required of all for the country, when we are changing everything, and particularly when we have reached a phase of decisive changes in the sphere of the economy, all of this is very serious, and here it will immediately be clear what Comrade Yeltsin is pursuing.

[Unidentified journalist] I want to ask the President about the trade agreement signed yesterday which has already caused political disputes. Secretary of State Baker said that Congress will not [word indistinct] until the Soviet side approves legislation on emigration. Does that mean that after the adoption of the Soviet law you will also be ready to offer the Soviet Union favored nation status? And a question about the Baltic.

[Bush] As far as the Baltics is concerned, we had the opportunity to discuss it and it was said at a U.S. press conference a couple of weeks ago, that it causes pressure, but a linkage between a trade agreement and legislation on immigration [as heard]. I will not propose such legislation, let me say frankly, until the Soviet Union completes the process, the legislative process, guaranteeing the right to emigration.

[Unidentified journalist] What about the step of actually granting most-favored-nation status.

[Bush] As far as our linking it with immigration, I have already voiced my view.

[Unidentified journalist] Does this mean that most-favored- nation status will follow immigration legislation?

[Bush] We will come back to this later. The linkage between immigration, sorry, between. The point is that the most-favored-nation status is to be linked to immigration laws. There are other agreements on grain, on maritime shipping, but as far as differences on the Baltic are concerned, this is one of the aspects that is having an effect on our relations. We have never recognized the inclusion of the Baltic states in the Soviet Union. That is our historical standpoint. This is a subject of concern which affects a broad range of issues between the two countries. Frankly speaking, I am very pleased. First, I have tried to speak very frankly to President Gorbachev, not only here, but also prior to his arrival, indicating the difficulties which I come across, (?just as) Jim Baker speaks to Eduard Shevardnadze, pointing to problems that we regard as important in our new relationship. It is important for both sides to know what problems each side has. Congress has its rights. Congress has the right to study what I sign and express its own judgements on whether this is in our interests. I have after all signed a trade agreement and believe that it is in our interests. The same goes for the grain and maritime agreements, but this does not mean what I have lessened my concern for the Baltic. But as far as linkage is concerned, in response to your question, and with respect to the most-favored-nation status, this is a linkage with the adoption of legislation on immigration.

[Pumpyanskiy] Pumpyanskiy of NOVOYE VREMYA. In connection with this summit there has been much debate on the topic of strength and weakness. Some speak from a position of strength, others from a position of weakness. How would you define what a strong position is and what place does the factor of strength, all in all, have in the new thinking today? What are the components of strength? And what makes for a strong politician and for strong policy? This is a question for both presidents.

[Gorbachev] OK I will start, in order to give President Bush a brief rest. I think that there is a certain speculation about this. Both in the preceding period, and during the talks, we have acted, representing our peoples and countries, and understanding between whom the dialogue is taking palce. And it seems to me that to suppose that either of us, either I or President Bush, could dictate to each other, to the Soviet Union, is absurd, that would be the greatest of mistakes, on which basis there could be no progress at all. I think that this is being suggested in connection with the fact that at the moment the Soviet Union is in a phase of profound changes. Since the matter concerns fundamental changes, we are leaving behind one way of life and some forms of living in favor of other ones, we are changing our political system, there is a new model in the economy, all these are fundamental things. Debates are in progress, doubts are being voiced, points of view are being compared. This is important, because after all, the matter concerns the future. It is natural that people are looking on with particular interest. We can feel in our own country how tense society is, how politicized it is, but looking in from the outside, and not knowing all the nuances and all the deep-down sentiments, so to say, one can fall into mistaken conclusions, you know. And hence the question about how long Gorbachev has left to stay in his post, and how perestroyka will end up, and so on. Even this, I consider, can be classed as part of this process of profound changes. Probably we cannot get by without this. I think that the most important thing is, the fact that all this that is going on is a confirmation of the fact that we are not just chucking our rubbish into the yard, we are really changing our society in a cardinal fashion, we are turning it around, within, toward people, toward people's lives, on the principles of freedom and democracy, and we are turning it and making it open to the outside world. That is the essence of it. There are no differences among us, Soviet people, about this, and I hope that journalist Pumpyanskiy is also on this side, so to speak. Perhaps there is just a part of society...after all, the dispute is about how to get this done, how to get it done, in order not to lose what is worth taking with us further down the road, and to get rid of what hinders us. This, after all, is... I do not think we have tackled such tasks in the history of our country, and of our state. And I do not know if any country or any people has tackled them in such a historically short period of time. Therefore, we value so much the fact that there is, all the same, understanding throughout the world. And from this point of view I have to say that I want to note that this is evidence of the far-sightedness and wisdom of President Bush and his colleagues, to say nothing of the American public, who, in general, also understand what is happening in the Soviet Union now and understand that this is necessary for us, first and foremost, of course—and, of course, we have to tackle it ourselves, above all—but everybody is well aware that it is necessary for the world and all peoples. I think that without these changes we will not get a better world, a stable world or a balanced and harmonized world. Therefore, the central point in world politics today is the restructuring of the Soviet Union, not because we are there, but because it is an objective reality.

[Bush] May I simply add that the United States is not trying to proceed from positions of strength and weakness. I tried to say in my greetings to President Gorbachev: We bear a special responsibility to solve questions of peace on earth. No other country bears such a degree of responsibility as the Soviet Union and the United States. Consequently, we are not seeking winners or losers. We welcome those reforms which are bringing our sides closer in the economy and the field of human rights, but we are not trying to achieve advantages. We sat down one to one, attempting to work out an agreement, to come closer together on vitally important issues concerning other countries too. And we bear responsibility for the status of the Soviet Union, the status of the United States, so I can assure all of you journalists, European and Soviet journalists, that the approach of the United States is from a position of mutual respect. We have a unique responsibility in the world, and I am very pleased that we shall be meeting more often now. I cannot fail to take advantage of the occasion to contribute to the stability of peace throughout the world. That's my position on this.

[Moderator] The international press.

[Journalist] THE ECONOMIST. In accordance with your remarks: If you are, on the one hand, opponents and, on the other hand, allies, are you prepared to say that your countries are now allies sooner than opponents?

[Bush] I don't want to get into rhetoric. Some people understand alliance one way and others a different way. As for opponents, sometimes this concept signifies hostility. I think that we have travelled a long way from the lowest point of the cold war. I don't even know how to express this in figures, but we would never have been able to discuss and have yesterday's conversation at Camp David or at the White House some days ago—such a thing would have been impossible 20 years ago And the more reforms, the closer our relations become Neither side has attempted to paper over the differences. I think that's a general answer.

[Journalist] The English paper THE GUARDIAN. A question for President Bush. Are there conditions in which you would be prepared to propose the total dissolution of NATO? Where is the danger to justify it? [words indistinct]

[Gorbachev] I shall listen to the precise translation while the President replies.

[Bush] Shall I start? As far as the threat is concerned, it seems to me that it is unpredictability and instability. That is the threat. I think the further participation and presence of the United States in Europe should not be seen as hostile to Soviet interests. I hope our further presence there will be seen as a stabilizing element. NATO, the existing apparatus, which I think, having an extended task can ensure in the best way such stability as regards our divergence of views with the Soviet Union. But it is this, and not the thinking of the cold war, that dictates our decision to remain in Europe and our desire to give a broader role to NATO in accordance with Article 2 of the NATO charter. Lester Pearson has assured me that NATO has such a broader role. So we consider that this does not contradict the broader role of the European process or the expansion of the Common Market. I think this is a non-hostile way of providing a stabilizing American presence.

[Gorbachev] Allow me to respond to this very important question. First, a general remark. It seems to me that if some option is proposed which would push out, or be accompanied by the pushing out or isolation on the European continent either of the United States or of the Soviet Union, I'd say definitely, and could predict, that that option is doomed. Doomed in the sense that it would be difficult to implement, and above all, it would lead to an exacerbation, and not an improvement, of the situation. We therefore start from the premise that we shall not be able to move on in restructuring international relations, including the main area, the European, without the participation—active participation—of the United States. And of the Soviet Union. These are realities. And behind them, there is a great responsibility behind these realities. That is my first point.

The second is that, yes, we assume, the option which we assume will still be found, and which would give a powerful boost to—and would help to strengthen the European process—must necessarily include some transitional period, during which we would work together to produce a final conclusion, a final document, whereby the rights—the rights given by the outcome of the war to the four victorious countries—would be exhausted. And this is a question which calls for, it's a question posed by history and it must be completed appropriately and within the framework of international law.

At the same time the unification of Germany, its existence, these two events together would signify that this is an independent sovereign state. I do not know and would not like to speculate on the dates at this stage, but I think that we should be acting very energetically now so that some kind of synchronization, if only an incomplete one, or a semblance of synchronization between the internal processes which lead to the united Germany and the changes, the settlement, the processes of settling the external aspects—to be combined more or less. I envisage, and in our position I have suggested many variants. They are there. I think the American side has paid attention to several such moments, as I have noticed during the discussion. I am now speaking only of my own supposition and not expressing it as though I heard it from the President—that they have something to think about. In the same way as we too will think over the whole of the U.S.'s position.

[Cochrane] John Cochrane. Mr. Gorbachev, on the question of the united Germany's participation in NATO—(?there are complaints about) the West's insensitivity towards your [word indistinct] security. Some people think that German participation in NATO and the American presence will ensure your needs and necessities and that your main problem is related to pride, that the united Germany's participation in NATO will be humiliating for the USSR. Frankly, have you discussed this question with Mr. Bush and what are your ideas in this matter?

[Gorbachev] First, I do not think that what I say on this very important question of world politics looks like a complaint, mine or the Soviet Union's. It would be a humiliation if the Soviet Union goes around like a petitioner with a complaint, having gone to Washington, or Bonn, or some other place. This is out of the question, please bear it in mind. This is the first point. Second, you know, there is a process under way, a beneficial, fruitful one, and look how far we have progressed in this process. And we are entitled to put this matter in such a way that each subsequent step will strengthen and not weaken it, we have a right. Take our negotiations on the 50 percent reduction of strategic offensive arms. If you were given the whole picture of this whole negotiating process, you would have seen what battles we had for each and every point. Why? Because nobody wants his security to be undermined. By the way, our position is such that to have better security than the United States will be unacceptable to us. Matters will not move forward in such a situation. I would recommend all our partners to think this position over. If decisions are made which cause concern to the Soviet Union, this will not be beneficial, not only for the Soviet Union, but to them as well. The question therefore arises: A united Germany, its appearance on the horizon, all this is something very serious. While welcoming the Germans' aspiration and supporting their desire to unite, we ought to think about how to preserve the balance which has come about and which took shape over the decades. And this is the central point. If we take just one point of view, then I think it would be incomplete. It gives rise to fears. If this is so then—if there were no other way out, but I believe that a variant will be found nevertheless which will be to everyone's liking—but if there were only that variant and people wished to impose it upon us, that is what we are rejecting—then we ought to go back and look at where we have found ourselves. What about our security? How are we to act with our armed forces? And we are reforming and reducing them, after all. How are we to regard Vienna? What are we to do there? You see, these are strategic questions, for everything in Europe is the highest level of strategy. There is one path. It gives rise to some doubts and suspicions, and it could slow everything down. And there is the path that we are proposing of finding a variant, be it once again an American or German or British one. We are not making any claims. The one claim we are making is that it should be a variant which would strengthen everything in Europe,. not weaken it.

Well, as for the second part, it wounds people's pride. You know, it's not a matter of pride. Should I recall once again today that 27 million people died in our country at the fronts, in partisans' detachments, in captivity—27 million in World War II and 18 million maimed and wounded; then in my opinion it is not a matter of pride but of justice and of supreme justice. These people, these sacrifices of our people, give us the right to put the question to all peoples, and we have the moral foundation for this, so that what was attained through these sacrifices should not turn into fresh dangers. There you are, in fact. Therefore I think that everything here is as it should be.

[Bush] I should like to add, Mr. President, in reply to the question, that the answer is no. Our policy is not at all based on pride or arrogance. It is based on the fact that the American perspective seems to us to be the best one for the future. It represents stability in both Europe and other areas. So the considerations you mentioned are completely unconnected with them, they have nothing to do with the formulation of U.S. policy. We do what we think is best for the United States, for the rest of the free world and for the Soviet Union.

[(Ashelechkai)] (Koba Ashelechkai), TV Japan. President Gorbachev, you say that you have established new relations with the United States. Please say, how do you intend to develop such a process in Asia and the Pacific zone? Do you intend to (?invite) some representatives to (?the CSCE) conference in Europe from representatives of the other zone?

[Gorbachev] It seems to me that on this score I have spoken quite extensively. And I think that what I said in Vladivostok and in Krasnoyarsk remains in force, and I reaffirm this approach. And I think that it has not yet gone into oblivion, the processes have been set in motion in this region, too, where thousands of millions of people live, one way or another. Here, probably, everything will be more complicated, taking into account the real specifics, and we have to act mindful of the realities, and not copy the European process, but at the same time, making use of this experience. I can already say that what has happened with weapons—medium-range missiles on the border with China—and the fact that a certain dialogue has now developed between countries, and finally the fact that we have now embarked on and progressed somewhat along the road of settling the situation in Afghanistan, this is already a sign indicating that this positive process is, so to speak, already taking shape here.

Of course, I think that this path will be both longer and more difficult. But nevertheless, it is particularly necessary here, because all these peoples need to gain an opportunity to direct all resources into overcoming the problems which have accumulated here, the social problems.

That is the first thing. And second, I have in mind that following the intensive contacts and the dialogue that we have with India and now with China, and with other countries, with Indonesia, I intend to travel to Japan in order to open up this area, so to speak, this front as well, for substantial talks. We will step up work in this area. And I would like to say straight away, and I think that here too, we should cooperate with the United States of America. I have said this before and in these speeches as well, and I would like to state this again to you, in the presence of the President of the United States of America.

[Unidentified journalist] Mr. President. This question is for Bush, but please, Mr. President Gorbachev, please answer as well. Six weeks ago you suggested that the situation with respect to Lithuania—has your attitude changed in this respect? Have you received any assurances that the embargo will be lifted?

[Bush] No, there have been no such assurances. I cannot say that anything has changed. I do not recall saying that I am losing patience. I have not said that. I have tried to make clear to everybody that we have not recognized the inclusion of the Baltic states in the Soviet Union and consequently, we differ from the Soviet Union on this matter. The Soviet Union regards this as an internal matter, while we believe that, since we have not recognized their inclusion, the problem seems different to us. However, this matter was discussed, broadly discussed. I am pleased to state that conversations are being held there also with the participation of various leaders, and I hope that these matters will be resolved. I believe as much as before in self-determination. This is the essence of the American belief, thinking, the American politics. I have not moved one iota away from this. But I would now hand the mike over to President Gorbachev, who sees things differently.

[Gorbachev] I do not even know what I can say to you now, since two days ago, in a conversation with representatives of the leadership of the Congress I set out our standpoint quite thoroughly. It seems to me that our standpoint is constructive and convincing. Our constitution records and provides for every people the right to choose self-determination, right up to secession. We did not have documents, laws, which could regulate...there was no mechanism that could regulate the implementation of this right. Now such a law exists. And so, we are reforming our federation and are expanding the sovereign rights of the republics, and we hope that a full-blooded federation is what is vital and will remove all the problems that have accumulated. This is our belief. That is how we are acting. There is to be a sitting of the Council of the Federation in the very near future, at which steps, deadlines, and ways toward resolving this task in practice will be examined. And this process will probably progress in such a way that it will presuppose the prèsence of various links, of various levels of federative links, as well as various links between the republics. This will evidently be a new process, a new form of links, which would meet the aims of perestroyka, our aims of reforming, of transforming the federation. This is one direction. If any of the republics will, nevertheless, within this process be raising a question and will raise it—then this must be resolved within the framework of the constitutional process. We are in favor of this proceeding exactly on the basis of constitution. The other approach is a dead end. And the experience that we have—not only in connection with Lithuania, but also in other republics while resolving inter-ethnic problems—shows that when they are trying to find, trying to resolve the problems in a different way, ignoring the constitution, it always ends in exacerbation, confrontation, and does not bring anything good either to the people, or to families, or to the economy, or to the general atmosphere in the country.

The USSR president as well as the U.S. President—I know the Constitution of the United States of America—as one of his main duties has to defend the constitution. I swore an oath on the constitution to fulfil this. That is why we are ready to resolve any question, including the one put forward by the Supreme Soviet of the Lithuanian union republic, within the framework of the constitutional process. And this presupposes, by the way, a referendum as well. And those who have organized such a solution, if such it may be called, of the question on the statehood of Lithuania will submit it to the referendum, and we will also submit our variant of the solution. And it is up to people to choose. And after that choice is made, I am sure no less than five or even seven years will be required until we sort it all out. Such a divorce suit will be under way. There are, you see, 800,000 non-Lithuanians living there. There are defense facilities, missiles, and the Navy there. Today's territory of Lithuania includes five rayons which once belonged to Belorussia. Stalin gave them Klaipeda, which the Soviet Union received as a result of the Second World War, along with Kaliningrad, East Prussia. He made it part of the territory of Lithuania. This question was raised, to give it back to Russia. I recently held a press conference with Mitterand, President of France, in Moscow, the same way as with President Bush, and I said: Listen, in order to decide what to do with overseas territories, with Caledonia, France has allocated a period of 10 years for this. How on Earth can we consider such issues in our circumstances, during secret hasty meetings at night, in a rush before the Third Congress of People's Deputies has started—to vote as quickly as possible. What is this, a responsible policy? I do not know. I think it is we who are acting according to the mandate of the third congress, and it is we who have a large reserve of goodwill and constructiveness at our disposal. We will do everything to resolve the issue on the basis of constitutional approaches. And anything else is impossible. Any other way is out of the question. I am referring all the time—this does not mean, of course, that I am asking the president to come and introduce order at our place—but

I am referring all the time to President Bush, who would have resolved such question in 24 hours, he would have restored the constitution in any land, in any state. [laughter]. But we will take out own decision on this. I would like to state here with all the responsibility so that you know what we want, for this question to be resolved in such a way that all the interests are taken into account, and within the framework of the constitution.

Gorbachev Departs With 'Fine Feelings'

LD0306183690 Moscow TASS in English 1822 GMT 3 Jun 90

[By TASS special correspondents]

[Text] Washington June 3 TASS—The four-day Washington summit, described by the world press as one of the major events of the 20th century, is over. Mikhail Gorbachev and George Bush—the two statesmen whose names will obviously be henceforth associated with the decisive turn to the peaceful development of civilization—shake hands and wish each other all the best. Their wives, who made friends and established cordial relations during the visit, parted in a very touching manner.

The convoy of limousines leaves the White House ground heading for the area of monuments, where a gun salute greets their arrival. Secretary of State James Baker invites Mikhail and Raisa Gorbachev to inspect the guard of honour.

Asked with what feelings he was leaving Washington, the Soviet president said, "fine feelings. A feeling that we have done good work".

After the official ceremony, Gorbachev and his entourage took helicopters to Andrews Air Force Base. The Soviet president will visit Minneapolis and San Francisco before leaving for home.

Gorbachev Arrives in Minneapolis

LD0306191990 Moscow TASS in English 1910 GMT 3 Jun 90

[By TASS special correspondents]

[Text] Minneapolis, Minnesota June 3 TASS—Upon completing the official programme of his visit to the United States, the Soviet president began on Sunday a tour of the United States of America. He arrived in Minneapolis on the same day.

At the airport of this major business centre of the U.S. midwest he was accorded a warm welcome by the local authorities, members of the public and the business community.

Mikhail Gorbachev will attend a luncheon at the governor's place, see the sights of St. Paul and Minneapolis, visit a farmstead and the Control Data electronic company headquarters.

He will meet members of the business community and leaders of the mid-west argo-business during his brief stay here.

Gorbachev Greeted Upon Arrival

LD0406095590 Moscow Television Service in Russian 0830 GMT 4 Jun 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast; correspondent Levskoy video report from Minneapolis]

[Text] [Video shows Gorbachev's plane arriving, Gorbachev and Raisa Gorbacheva being welcomed at airport, limousine moving off, greeted by cheering crowds en route, Gorbachev circulating among crowds] The city of Minneapolis, the industrial and financial center of the state of Minnesota, is two hours away from Washington by air. In spite of rain and a pretty strong wind, inhabitants of the city and numerous journalists came to meet the Soviet guests. Mikhail Sergeyevich and Raisa Maksimovna Gorbacheva were greeted at the foot of the aircraft steps by State Governor Rudi Perpich and his wife, senators, congressmen, and representatives of business circles. A detail of interest: Shostakovich's Festival Overture was played during the reception. That is also a sign of respect and liking for the country and its culture.

The cars bearing the Soviet guests moved off to the city. Another feature: The journey to the town was filmed by a television camera mounted on a helicopter. Television cameras were also operating on vehicles along the route. Before the arrival, the city newspapers named a number of places where the cortege might pause on its route. Even though it was Sunday, many inhabitants came out to meet the guests; like they did in Washington, people wanted to communicate with the Soviet president, to shake his hand and say a few well-meaning words to him. It must be admitted that the bodyguard had a hard time of it that day.

And so, Mikhail Gorbchev arrived at the state governor's residence.

Gorbachev Stresses Cooperation

LD0406194890 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 4 Jun 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [Correspondent Zolotarevskiy] The next point on the president's program in Minneapolis was a meeting with business circles in the Radisson Hotel. The owner of the Radisson hotel, Mr. (Carlson), is one of the most important representatives of American business. My colleague from the local television station advised me, "Look who is sitting next to Carlson and you will see the whole of American capitalism." Even if this is a slight exaggeration, the fact remains that the cream of the business world of the Middle West was present at the business meeting with Gorbachev.

After a short welcoming ceremony, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev addressed those assembled. In his speech he recalled that the best situation from the point of view of business, financial and other possibilities in the Soviet Union will fall to the share of those who, without fearing difficulties, and without being afraid of the complicated elements of the present moment, will actively become involved in business cooperation with the Soviet Union. Mikhail Sergeyevich pointed out that at the present time 1,500 joint enterprises are operating; of those 150 are with the United States of America. He also drew attention to the fact that the possibilities for cooperation are expanding extraordinarily and are becoming increasingly interesting in connection with [military to civilian] conversion. He pointed out some specific fields in which cooperation between our countries is possible and desirable. These include such areas as the problem of creating a Trans-Siberian optic fibre conduit which will complete the worldwide network, and the fundamental modernization of the USSR's automobile industry with the participation of U.S. firms. The USSR president did, moreover, note that this type of joint activity is a sort of tradition because the American automobile industry took part in setting up the Soviet automobile industry more than 60 years ago.

Yet another field in which big and very important prospects exist is cooperation in setting up computer systems. In this connection Mikhail Sergeyevich mentioned an agreement that already exists which is being effectively implemented. Another project which is already being worked on is joint activity regarding the provision of education in the Soviet Union with computers.

Mikhail Sergeyevich recalled that he had spoken with Vice President Quayle, in particular about cooperation in space. It is precisely in this sphere of cooperation that the vice president showed particular attention. And here, according to the words of Mikhail Sergeyevich, the joint potential is simply immense.

Comrade Gorbachev paid great attention in his speech to the problems of possible cooperation in the development of agriculture in the Soviet Union. He also pointed out that it is necessary to create a fundamentally new class of machines and mechanisms which will assist the farmers and lease contractors in using machines for working the land on their allotments.

The representatives of the business circles of the Middle West listened to the speech by the Soviet president with great attention.

[Video shows scenes at meeting, with Gorbachev speaking; no voice heard]

Meeting With Businessmen Previewed

LD0406004890 Moscow TASS in English 0020 GMT 4 Jun 90

[By TASS special correspondent]

[Text] Minneapolis (Minnesota) June 4 TASS—"We welcome you, President Gorbachev". The illuminated billboards on Minneapolis's busiest crossroad have been tuned to the atmosphere of the Soviet-U.S. summit for several days now. On Sunday when the Soviet president arrived here, the population of the 400,000-strong city swelled. Overbooked airlines, hotels, and the giant closed stadium swarmed by a horde of journalists bear evidence to the sincere desire by Americans to meet with the Soviet president.

The change-about in Soviet-U.S. relations, which has taken shape recently, opens the way for broad mutually advantageous trade and economic cooperation between the two states. Thanks to the new salutary atmosphere of bilateral relations, the belief grows in the American business community that conditions may be soon created for a considerable increase in trade between the USSR and the U.S., which must continue to grow and reach a level matching the economic potential and the status of the great powers.

Interest in business cooperation is so great that there are specific and rather significant results already now during the visit. For example, immediately after the luncheon given by Minnesota Governor Rudy Perpich for the Soviet president, the formation of a "Gorbachev-Maxwell Institute of Technology" was announced. The announcement ceremony forced changes in the tight schedule of the visit. Pergamon press president Robert Maxwell expressed hope that the joint project will gain worldwide recognition which is due to an institute doing research into global problems. American, Soviet and European scientists will join efforts to do research, which will transcend national boundaries, both geographic and political.

Mikhail Gorbachev's meeting with American businessmen was the highlight of the day. It could not be decided in Minnesota until the last moment who the 54 lucky holders of invitations are. Much interest is shown here to the idea of creating free trade zones, consortiums, joint ventures, and fostering other new forms of cooperation.

Minneapolis is a major industrial centre which lays a serious claim to be called the capital of American business. It is often referred to as "the heart of America". It is not accidental that difficulties confronting the economic reform in the USSR evoked great interest and response here. American businesmen are concerned over the obstacles that hamper Soviet-U.S. cooperation, both economic and political. It is widely believed in the U.S. business community that the time has ccome to reconsider U.S. trade policy towards the USSR and to squarely pose the question of cancelling the discriminatory Jackson-Vanik amendment which prevents the USSR from receiving most favoured nation status.

Thomas Naylor, a Duke University economics professor, said the time was ripe for the United States to suspend the Jackson-Vanik amendment, which was a major obstacle to American-Soviet trade since the 1970s.

Gorbachev Addresses U.S. Businessmen

LD0506105990 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0040 GMT 5 Jun 90

[By TASS special correspondents]

[Text] Minneapolis, Minnesota, 5 June (TASS) As already announced, the USSR president met representatives of business circles and the agro-industrial complex on Sunday. Representatives of the leading U.S. corporations showed their interest in this meeting.

M.S. Gorbachev addressed those at the meeting:

A few hours ago, President Bush and I summed up the results of the Washington summit, which, I am sure, will go down in history as a meeting of hope and optimism, he said.

I must say that in the talks with President Bush and our unofficial exchange of opinions in Camp David and in the numerous contacts with Americans during these days, economic questions have come up many times in a major way.

The restructuring of our economy is aimed at the Soviet Union entering the 21st century as a democratic, law-based state, one of the organic components of the world economy.

The key factor here is raising the degree of our economy's capatibility with the world market's laws and nature.

We realize that to create a genuine market economy, a huge amount of work has to be done. This means, first of all, legislation on taxation, enterprises, anti-monopoly and credit and finance legislation, and on social protection measures.

At its foundation lies the policy of multiplicity of forms of property and management and the business independence of enterprises inside and outside the country. Obviously they are not all of practical interest to you now. But the main thing is you have the chance to choose your partner.

We have started to modernize the range of tools in our foreign economic policy. New customs rates and a system of measures for non-tariff regulation according to international standards are being introduced. We are happy to have gained observer status at GATT. This was possible thanks to the U.S. position. We consider our rapprochement with GATT will speed up the process of intergrating the USSR into the world economy.

New forms of foreign economic ties are appearing: in just two years, more than 1,500 joint enterprises have been registered in the USSR, of which about 150 are with U.S. participation. At present, the biggest is the cooperation project between a Soviet foreign economic consortium of 22 enterprises and a U.S. trade consortium to which Chevron, Eastman Kodak, ADM [Archer Daniels Midland], Johnson and Johnson, RJR Nabisco and Mercator Corporation belong. It plans to set up 20-25 joint enterprises in the USSR for processing agricultural output and producing food [as received] goods in the medicine and health, power engineering, computing and information technology areas.

An agreement was signed on 2 June 1990 on establishing a joint enterprise to survey and work the Korolevskiy oil deposit in the Lake Tengiz area.

We hope a U.S.-Soviet medical consortium will take off. U.S. firms and Soviet organizations are holding talks on setting up six joint enterprises to produce medicines, diagnostic and treatment equipment, and hygienics and prophylactic facilities. ASTEC is doing a lot of work.

Joint enterprise is only one of the forms. The choice of form of cooperation is up to the partners themselves. For instance, new prospects arise in connection with the creation in the USSR of free enterprise zones.

The lowering of military confrontation and the process of disarmament are putting conversion on the agenda. We are inviting you to join in the joint development of technological and production opportunities for civilian needs which are being freed.

Hitherto political dialogue has been lagging very much behind the building of the economic foundation of Soviet-U.S. relations. In Washington, we have started correcting this disproportion. The trade agreement, it can be said, is the cornerstone of such a foundation. When it is put into effect, it will be necessary to tackle the question of guarantees for investments and taxation.

On the whole, it is time to start using the various prerequisites more boldly. There are already many contacts. It is up to the contracts to ensure that projects start yielding a return.

We intend to embark resolutely on attracting foreign capital for the development of natural resources in the USSR, in various forms, from joint enterprises to concessions. Our republics, which are increasing their sovereignty, are showing great interest in this.

It is obvious that foreign partners must ensure that the strict requirements for the protection of the environment and for ecological cleanliness of production are complied with; this is an indispensable condition for such cooperation.

We have a large unsatisfied demand for telephone lines. Joint efforts would help not only the Soviet consumer, but also foreigners, businessmen working with Soviet partners. Such cooperation would help to improve the world telecommunication system too.

You probably know about the plan for a fiber-optic communications line across the whole of Siberia with the participation of an international consortium led by the U.S. company U.S. West. As well as serving internal civilian needs, this line will close a global communications ring and ensure first class service for the Pacific region and for Europe.

New prospects are opening up as a result of the agreement signed in Washington on air links.

The biggest railway organization in the world, the USSR Ministry of Railways, and the biggest rail company in the United States, Burlington Northern, are making contacts. The mastering of the Baykal-Amur railway and economic zone is opening up great possibilities.

The qualitative modernization of the Soviet motor vehicle industry presupposes active participation by foreign companies. Room will be found for U.S. firms too.

In the area of the computerization of the Soviet Union I would like to pick out two of the many plans:

—Cooperation with Control Data will improve the efficiency and safety of atomic power engineering;
—The joint plan of IBM and the State Committee for Public Education will help the computerization of our schools.

The fields of aviation and space. A large contract was concluded recently with the General Electric Company for the purchase of engines for passenger planes. This is the first such deal with a U.S. firm. A number of U.S. companies have expressed an interest in the joint development and production of a new generation of civilian aircraft.

It would be possible to carry out launchings of U.S. commercial satellites by Soviet carrier rockets to our mutual advantage. There are no obstacles to this from our side. I spoke about this a few days ago with Vice President Quayle, who put forward an initiative about cooperating with us on peaceful space.

True, in cooperation of this sort worries arise lest high tech be used for military ends. But if there are misgivings, let us discuss "confidence building measures" that would rule out such a use. Why should this be possible in the military sphere, as it has turned out, and not in the economic one?

You, as midwesterners, are most interested in links in agriculture. The new Soviet-U.S. grain agreement is an important step. But it is no less important that U.S. grain exporting companies should be competitive in their prices, conditions of payment, and quality.

Here is a fact: in 1988 the Soviet Government adopted a large scale program for the modernization of the light and food indusry. But U.S. companies were not able to participate in it because they were uncompetitive, and also because, unlike the firms in other countries, they were not ready to give long term credit for equipment.

In general, I have to say that we are heading toward self-sufficiency in agricultural produce. For this reason it is expanding cooperation in the area of agroindustrial technology and production that is most promising. In a word, the potential for mutually beneficial association is enormous.

We made an important political breakthrough in Washington, which should also be favorably reflected in the economic side of our relations.

I have already told your colleagues in Washington and I have told businessmen in Moscow as well: Whoever is with us now, won't lose by it. Whoever turns aside from us, will remain apart.

In conclusion, M.S. Gorbachev wished mutually advantageous deals to those assembled and expressed the hope that business links between the United States and the USSR will be successful.

A relaxed conversation between the USSR President and the representatives of U.S. business who had come from all corners of the United States then ensued. Many of them had already had occasion to meet and talk to M.S. Gorbachev nd to discuss various problems of Soviet-U.S. cooperation during business trips to Moscow. However, there had never been such a unique opportunity as a Soviet leader meeting representatives of the whole spectrum of interests in the U.S. business world. The convesation did not, therefore, only touch upon a wide range of matters of economic cooperation but also revealed the difficulties that exist on the way toward building a sturdy business bridge between the USSR and the United States.

The most important moment in the dialogue was, perhaps, the fact that almost all those taking part expressed satisfaction at the conclusion of a trade agreement with the United States. That is the difference between business people and poets: that they "take the bull by the horns" without excessive preambles and curtseying, that is they respond to a proposal not in words but by concrete action. Thus, many of those taking part in the conversation put forward their own specific projects here in Minneopolis only two days after the signing of the trade agreement. For example, former U.S. Secretary of Agriculture John Block spoke in favor of most-favored-nation status being granted in the area of agriculture and the food industry. On the instructions of the Citizens' Network organization's council for agriculture, he reported that this organization has promised the support of 26 farms and agroindustrial enterprises of major U.S. corporations. Five former U.S. secretaries of agriculture also signed this appeal supporting granting the USSR most-favored-nation terms.

The representatives of a number of America's leading corporations briefed the USSR president on the results already achieved in organizing joint enterprises. Denis

Sokol, president of a medical consortium, reported on the very latest agreement on the setting up of three joint interprises to manufacture medical technology and equipment. He believes that the medical line is just as much a priority as that of agriculture and in this connection he asked the USSR president to take this into account when forming further Soviet foreign economic programs and also selecting the participants in the first U.S. international management school in Phoenix (Arizona), which is to take place in December. This will be the first high-level meeting of Soviet and U.S. businessmen. M.S.Gorbachev spoke in favor of the undertaking.

An original summary of these numerous specific proposals was contained in the speech by New York businessman Simon Chilewitz. His view is that it is essential to set up as a matter of urgency a small committee with special rights for decision-making which would include eminent Soviet and U.S. specialists who would determine the main priorities of cooperation for each specific year. Only this committee, stressed the businessman, should determine which of the Soviet economy's requirements are the most important at a given stage.

M.S. Gorbachev supported the businessman, stressing that the idea of creating a stable control mechanism for foreign economic links between the USSR and the United States is not only being discussed in our country but already being implemented within the framework of a Soviet-U.S. commission. The decision has been adopted to dedicate a special working group of the commission to this.

Since they are interested in the establishment not merely of varied, but of clear links with Soviet enterprises, many of the participants in the meeting voiced dissastifaction over the high level of risk involved in the initial steps of doing business on Soviet soil. In particular, John Crystal, a well-known banker from Iowa, expressed his disillusionment over the state of affairs in the sphere of trade, and in particular in trade in agricultural produce. He is unhappy, for instance, with the existing restrictions on investments in the Soviet Union and on the repatriation of U.S. profits. Furthermore, he said, the revenue accruing from these investments in the Soviet Union will certainly raise the question in the near future of the need for the ruble to be convertible.

Responding to these questions, the USSR president reported that a document is being prepared which will guarantee the security of capital investments and provide the procedure for and possibility of exporting and reinvesting capital. Dealing with the prospects for a switch to a convertible rouble, the president mentioned the intention of switching in the near future to trading within CEMA at world prices. "We must also being our domestic prices into line with world prices," he said. "Furthermore, we must prepare our economy for this and make it more efficient and stable. If we "open up" the Soviet Union and introduce a convertible rouble now, then we will be plundered within three months. We will move step by step by step toward full convertibility in the context of our economy's comprehensive transformation. We used to believe that this path would be a very long one. Now, though, we think we can and must shorten it."

Gorbachev Remarks on Proposed Institute

LD0406012990 Moscow TASS in English 0054 GMT 4 Jun 90

[Text] Minneapolis (Minnesota) June 4 TASS—A ceremony, devoted to the formation of a "Gorbachev-Maxwell Institute of Technology", was held on Sunday at the residence of Minnesota Governor Rudy Perpich. Mikhail Gorbachev arrived in Minnesota after winding up the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting in Washington.

At the new institute, Soviet, American and European scientists will join their efforts to explore a wide range of problems, including nature conservation, communications, information, health and nutrition. Funds for the institute will be contributed by Pergamon press president Robert Maxwell and the State of Minnesota.

Speaking at the ceremony, at which Maxwell announced the formation of the institute, Mikhail Gorbachev wished success to this project.

Gorbachev said "the idea was shared by businessmen, at least those of them who realised how many common problems face all of us, and we must join efforts to come to grips with them."

The Soviet president expressed the view that the new institute, which involved such prominent representatives of the business community as Robert Maxwell, is "another element of a new world, new cooperation which seem to be emerging between the USSR and the U.S., the USSR and Europe, many countries of the world and people. Aware of our differences," Gorbachev said, "we nevertheless join our efforts to address the problems that are of concern to all of us."

For his part, Robert Maxwell said the formation of the new institute dealing with the global problems which are of interest of the whole of mankind was the best manifestation of gratitude of Europeans to "President Gorbachev as well as President Bush for ending the cold war."

Gorbachev Visits Control Data Headquarters

LD0406035190 Moscow TASS in English 0324 GMT 4 Jun 90

[Text] Minneapolis (Minnesota) June 4 TASS—Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev said "the most important thing" in his talks with U.S. President George Bush was the fact that both leaders took steps in order to bring closer together the peoples of the USSR and the U.S., to give them greater opportunities to live in peace, cooperation, and to move away from rivalry toward partnership, friendship, and fruitful interaction. The Soviet

President made this statement at the headquarters of the Control Data company on Sunday, which he visited after meeting U.S. businessmen in Minneapolis.

Gorbachev said the decisions taken at the summit meeting in Washington rest on the support for the Soviet and U.S. presidents from their peoples.

"I believe in the good prospects of this policy, because the peoples of our countries will not allow us to pursue any different policy," he said.

On the same day the Soviet president left Minneapolis for San Francisco.

Gorbachev Finds Midwest 'Staggering'

LD0406203190 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 4 JUN 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [Correspondent Zolotarevskiy] "Control Data" is a leading American enterprise dealing with research and development of advanced computer systems. Soviet organizations have accords with "Control Data" on joint work for computer support of nuclear reactor safety. Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev mentioned this fact in his address to representatives of business circles. But literally 30 minutes before he arrived here, the Soviet delegation led by academician Velikhov signed another, even broader agreement on cooperation. The USSR president replied to the warm welcome and summed up briefly the results of his official visit.

[Begin recording] [Video shows Gorbachev being welcomed inside the Control Data office; Gorbachev looking at computer equipment; making a speech].

[Zolotarevskiy, addressing Gorbachev] Mikhail Sergeyevich, many people ask the same question: Why Minnesota?

[Gorbachev] This is precisely the America one has to see and to get to know because, while visiting capitals and having meetings there, one should, however, find time to get to know the country. Neither America nor the Soviet Union is fully represented by their respective capitals. And in this sense, the Midwest is the very Midwest where there are many interesting achievements. And yet another reason is also the fact that the Middle West is very keen on cooperating with us and many firms have already started moving towards us in spite of all the difficulties. And something else [making a gesture towards the hall]—there is mid-Russia!

[Zolotarevskiy] What are you impressions after this day at the Midwest?

[Gorbachev] Staggering!

[Zolotarevskiy] Thank you.

[video shows Zolotarevskiy and Gorbachev talking] [end recording]

Gorbachev Comments on Middle East

LD0406020790 Moscow TASS in English 0156 GMT 4 Jun 90

[Text] Minneapolis (Minnesota) June 4 TASS—"U.S. President Bush and I discussed the situation in the Middle East very thoroughly and in several stages," Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev said in a brief interview to foreign correspondents after meeting representatives of the U.S. business community in Minnesota.

Gorbachev arrived in this American state after winding up the official part of his state visit to the United States.

Foreign journalists asked the Soviet President if he was prepared to make a visit to Israel.

"Let us be frank," Gorbachev replied. "The time has not come yet. I will tell you frankly, let the Israeli leaders think over what has been discussed in Washington. So that they would not find themselves in a situation when they will be the only people in the world who do not understand."

Having noted that he extensively discussed the Middle East problem with the U.S. President, Gorbachev said that "there is a chance of reaching agreement on unravelling this tightly-knit knot."

He also said that the Soviet Union and the U.S. are prepared "to become guarantors of the security of all Arab states drawn into the conflict, as well as the security, independence, and sovereignty of Israel. These are very serious things," he added.

Gorbachev Speaks at Governor's House

LD0406201490 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 4 Jun 90

[Remarks by USSR President Gorbachev at Minnesota governor's house in Minneapolis on 3 June; from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [Governor Perpich in English fading into Russian translation] Minnesotans are really excited that you are here.

[Gorbachev] We are glad, too, to be here. After all, it is no accident that we are here. This is something we wanted. And the fact that you gave us such a warm welcome...[voice fading] [video shows Gorbachev, Raisa, the governor and wife in a room]

[Zolotarevskiy] After a short conversation in the courtyard of the residence, an event took place which deserves our attention. [video briefly shows Gorbachev and others in the courtyard, cheering people]

Robert Maxwell, major British businessman, well-known in our country, has donated $50 million for setting up an international technological research center in Minneapolis. The center will be named after Gorbachev and Maxwell himself. In his speech, Maxwell said that scientists from the United States, the USSR, European and other countries will be able to work in this institute for the benefit of mankind. Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev spoke in reply. [video shows the governor, Raisa, other officials listening to Maxwell in a hall]

[Gorbachev] As I can see, this idea has been on the mind of Rudi Perpich, the state's governor, for many years. I see that this idea has, at last, been supported by representatives of the business world, at least by those businessmen who understand that all of us who live today on this earth face many common problems, and that we should solve them together. And I welcome this idea, which has also been backed by Mr. Robert Maxwell, whom I have known for a long time and whose active position I appreciate.

I see Mr. (Adrias) beside him. He is a man who in difficult political conditions, as it were, used to prove, together with his supporters and colleagues and other representatives of the U.S. business world, the need to develop economic links between our great peoples and countries. So, I see in this yet another element of a renewing world and the new cooperation that is taking shape between our countries, Europe, and between people. We are aware of our differences, we will not make a public issue of them and will join our efforts to tackle the problems that worry us all. I wish success to this enterprise. [video shows Gorbachev speaking, then shaking hands with those present]

Gorbachev Walkabout at Governor's House

LD0406201190 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 4 Jun 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [Gorbachev, addressing a girl, in Russian through interpreter] What is your name?

[Girl] (Brandy Pickinson).

[Gorbachev] What grade are you in?

[Girl] Sixth.

[Gorbachev] Almost like my granddaughter. [video shows Gorbachev talking to a girl amid a raving crowd]

[Gorbachev waving hand to the crowds] Thank you! All the best to you. All the best to you! [video shows hand-waving; ecstatic crowds; Gorbachev driven away in a limousine]

'Joint Statement' Issued on Ethiopia

PM0306203190 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 4 Jun 90 Second Edition p 7

[Unattributed report: "Soviet-American Joint Statement"]

[Text] The USSR and the United States have discussed the necessary aid to and the prospects for a political resolution of the internal conflict in Ethiopia. They welcome the Ethiopian government's consent to permit deliveries of food to the northern part of Ethiopia via the port of Massawa within the framework of the UN-organized aid program, and they consider that such operations should not jeopardize Ethiopia's unity or territorial integrity. They have also welcomed the Ethiopian government's consent to UN representatives' participation as observers in talks between the Ethiopian government and the Eritreans.

In addition, in order to resolve the growing famine problem, the USSR and the United States are ready to act jointly, combining their resources. American food will be delivered by Soviet aircraft, in order to demonstrate our common commitment to resolving this utterly tragic humanitarian problem.

Recognizing the existence of continuing political and military conflicts which aggravate the famine problem, and also recognizing the absence of progress in peace talks, the United States and the USSR support the idea of convening an international governmental conference under the UN aegis to settle the conflict situations in the Horn of Africa region.

Gorbachev Arrives in San Francisco

LD0406061290 Moscow TASS in English 0607 GMT 4 Jun 90

[By TASS Special correspondents]

[Text] San Francisco June 4 TASS—Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev, touring the United States after his summit with President George Bush, and his entourage arrived in San Francisco today.

Californians Welcome Gorbachev

LD0406065590 Moscow TASS in English 0635 GMT 4 Jun 90

[By TASS special correspondent]

[Text] San Francisco June 4 TASS—Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev, touring the United States after his summit with President George Bush, and his entourage arrived in San Francisco today.

At the airport, the Soviet leader was welcomed by California Governor George Duekmejian, San Francisco Mayor Art Agnos, U.S. Ambassador to the Soviet Union Jack Matlock, U.S. Secretary of Agriculture Clayton Yeutter, Secretary of Trade Robert Mosbacher, members of the U.S. Congress, members of the U.S. Congress from California, Soviet Consul General Valentin Kamenev and other officials and U.S. business and public figures.

From the airport, Gorbachev went to his residence, where he had talks with the Californian governor.

Gorbachev's 4 Jun Agenda Viewed

LD0406224290 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1800 GMT 4 Jun 90

[Report by correspondents Andrey Ptashnikov and Yuriy Kobaladze from the United States on Gorbachev's visit to San Francisco]

[Text] [Ptashnikov] We will report this story about Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's visit today to the United States in not quite the usual way. The thing is that Yuriy Kobaladze, who is not in San Francisco, does not have a direct radio line to Moscow. That is why we will talk to Yuriy over the phone. I would just like to let you know that there is an 11-hour time difference between Moscow and San Francisco. So San Francisco is on the line. Yuriy, first of all, say a couple of words about what is going on over there.

[Kobaladze] Today, the whole day, will be sated with a diverse and very intensive program. In the morning a meeting with Ronald Regan, former president of the United States, and his spouse, will take place at the USSR President's residence. So Mikhail Sergeyevich is expected to present Reagan with a commemorative medal and scroll of honor of the Armenian Soviet Socialist Republic for his help in eliminating the consequences of the earthquake in Armenia. Incidentally, Mikhail Sergeyevich will present George Deukmejiah, the governor of California, who was the coordinator of the campaign to raise money here in California to help the victims of the earthquake in Armenia, with the same medal and scroll of honor.

Then the most interesting, perhaps, and the most intensive event of today will take place—Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev will visit Stanford, where the famous Stanford University is situated. I will note, by the way, that the hall where this speech will take place accomodates almost 2,000 people. There were so many people who wanted to come that the students had to hold a lottery in order to obtain a ticket and attend this event. Also here, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and Raisa Maksimovna Gorbacheva will visit the art museum, where they will be presented with two paintings by Californian artists for the Soviet people.

[Ptashnikov] One more important meeeting with representatives of business circles on the U.S. west coast will take place today, as far as I know.

[Kobaladze] This meeting here is, generally speaking, awaited impatiently. It will take place in the Vermont Hotel after events in Stanford.

[Ptashnikov] Yuriy, I have the last question for you. When will Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and No Tae-u, president of South Korea meet? This was not planned before. As far as I knowm No Tae- u has already arrived in San Francisco, has he not?

[Kobaladze] Yes, that is true, he is already in San Francisco. The meeting is expected to be held at 0400 Moscow time [0000 GMT 5 June] I mean, in the Hotel Vermont. Incidentally, this meeting has aroused very great interest. Local political observers call this event historically important and they stress that it can become the beginning of the settlement of the Korean problem.

[Ptashnikov] I will remind you, esteemed listeners, of the fact that there are no diplomatic relations between the USSR and South Korea at the present time. Hence a conversation on this issue could take place at this meeting.

[Kobaladze] Yes, everybody expects it to be just so.

Gorbachev Meets With Reagan

LD0406193790 Moscow TASS in English 1932 GMT 4 Jun 90

[By TASS special correspondent]

[Text] San Francisco June 4 TASS—Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev, touring the United States after his official visit to Washington, is spending Monday in San Francisco.

In the morning Mikhail and Raisa Gorbachev met ex-president Ronald Reagan and his wife Nancy.

Gorbachev and Reagan recollected warmly their meetings in Geneva, Reykjavik, Washington and Moscow which marked the beginning of the search for better relations between the Soviet Union and the United States. They noted the importance of personal contacts in modern international politics.

Gorbachev presented to Reagan a commemorative medal and a diploma from the Armenian Republic in appreciation of Armenian relief aid after the earthquake.

The meeting took place in a sincere and well-meaning atmosphere.

The Soviet president then left for Stanford to meet students and staff of the famous university.

During his visit to San Francisco, Gorbachev is expected to meet and address representatives of the political and business communities of the U.S. western coast.

China

PRC Military Delegation Continues Visit

Belousov Receives General Liu

PM0506085390 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 3 Jun 90 Morning Edition p 5

[TASS report under general heading: "Official Reports"]

[Text] On 1 June a meeting took place between I.S. Belousov, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, and Colonel General Liu Huaqing, vice chairman of the PRC Central Military Commission, who is in the Soviet Union on an official visit at the Soviet Government's invitation. During a friendly talk there was a discussion of questions of mutual interest. Here special attention was paid to the problem of conversion.

Yazov, Liu Discuss Military Relations

LD0506102290 Moscow TASS in English 1016 GMT 5 Jun 90

[By TASS correspondent Oleg Moskovskiy]

[Text] Moscow June 5 TASS—Soviet Defense Minister Dmitriy Yazov today met Liu Huaqing, deputy chairman of the Central Military Council of the Chinese People's Republic. The Chinese guest is staying in the USSR on an official visit at the invitation of the Soviet Government.

Yazov and Liu held a warm, friendly conversation focusing on the state of Soviet-Chinese relations in the military field and prospects for strengthening and expanding contacts between representatives of the Soviet and Chinese Armed Forces.

The conversation was attended by Army General Mikhail Moiseyev, head of the General Staff of the USSR Armed Forces, and other officials, as well as Chinese ambassador to the USSR Yu Hongliang.

During his visit to the Soviet Union, the Chinese guest will meet party and military leaders as well as statesmen. He will visit a number of military and industrial facilities, Leningrad, Sevastopol and the Baykonur cosmodrome.

"I was pleasantly surprised by Russian hospitality and the cordial and warm reception given to me in the USSR," Liu told TASS. He added that he expects a lot from meetings and talks with Soviet military leaders. According to the general, better Soviet-Chinese relations in the military not only meet the interests of Soviet and Chinese peoples, but will also improve the political climate in the Asia-Pacific region and the world.

During his visit to the Kremlin, the Chinese guest went to Lenin's study. "I left the following entry in the guest book: 'The Chinese people will firmly follow the road bequeathed by the great leader of the proletariat—Lenin,'" Liu Huaqing said.

Laptev Talks With PRC Minister Wei

PM0506083190 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 4 Jun 90 Morning Edition p 3

[TASS report: "Exchange of Opinions"]

[Text] The inevitability of political pluralism and radical economic transformation has shown itself very acutely in the process of forming a new structure of Soviet power and changing it in our country. It is not easy for the Soviet Union's supreme organ of state power to take account of the combination of these problems. But it is essential, I.D. Laptev, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Soviet of the Union, observed in Moscow, 2 June, during a conversation with a Chinese delegation headed by Wei Jianxing, PRC minister of supervision.

Despite the fact that the conditions and the situation in our countries do not always coincide, the difficulties with which we have to contend are often similar. They are bound up with the transition from directive-based leadership of social life to an expansion of the role of legislation, the interlocutors observed.

I.D. Laptev expressed sincere interest in developing ties between our states on a fundamentally different, businesslike footing that is free from ostentation. China's experience and the particular features of the economic changes in that country are extremely instructive for us, the chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet chamber said. The special role played by control organs in countering abuse in foreign trade was stressed during the conversation.

G.V. Kolbin, chairman of the USSR People's Control Committee, took part in the meeting.

Delegation Reaches Trade Accord With PRC

LD0406170990 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1430 GMT 4 Jun 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] Friendly relations with our mighty neighbor China are bringing us the main thing that we could have expected, which was worth waiting for. We do not just want to live peacefully, but also to work together. Here is a report from Beijing by Vladimir Kulikov:

[Begin recording] [Kulikov] The talks held in Beijing by Soviet specialists, headed by Lyudmila Davletova, chairman of the State Committee for Light Industry at USSR Gosplan [State Planning Committee], ended with this meeting with Zou Jiahua, minister in charge of the PRC State Planning Commission. A fundamentally new factor in the delegation's work was that an accord was reached on linking the capacities of Chinese light industry to the primary processing of raw material bought from our country. This expands the possibilities for an increase in the production of consumer goods from this raw material, and will accelerate their journey to the Soviet market. Issues concerning the establishment of joint enterprises for the production of consumer goods were discussed and the possibilities of the technical reequipment of light industry enterprises in our countries were considered. They became acquainted with the operation of Chinese trade.

Are you pleased with the results of the work that has been done?

[Davletova] We have prepared a number of proposals which might be implemented right now and produce results. In particular, I wish to say that, to make up for a certain labor shortage of textiles and light industrial enterprises, we are today examining and signing a commercial deal here for the production of yarn from cotton and wool for workers in our country's knitwear industry. Our ministries of automotive and agricultural machine building have issued proposals for the preparation and organization of a joint enterprise for the production of bicycles and motor cycles. I have been struck by the multitude of goods which, unfortunately, do not exist on our shop shelves at present. You are simply dazzled by it.

[Kulikov] Well, the market really does strike guests to China at the moment with its variety and abundance of goods. But the members of the Soviet delegation by no means came here as guests. They came here to work. And we shall judge this work by its final result—the appearance of Chinese goods on shelves in Soviet shops. [video shows talks, goods in shops, Davletova] [end recording]

SRV, PRC Agree on Cambodian Government

OW0106132290 Moscow International Service in Mandarin 0100 GMT 22 May 90

[Text] Vietnam and China agreed to the decision made by Hun Sen, head of the Cambodian Government, and the opposition leaders of Cambodia to jointly form a coalition government after a ceasefire in Cambodia.

Vietnamese Foreign Minister Nguyen Co Thach announced this event. He arrived in Bangkok on 21 May after visiting the FRG. According to Nguyen Co Thach, the Phnom Penh government and Sihanouk clique will send six representatives respectively to the future Supreme Committee on National Reconciliation of Cambodia.

Hun Sen, Sihanouk, and Khieu Samphan, leader of the Khmer Rouge, have separately signed this decision through the mediation of Thailand. On the same day, the BANGKOK POST in Thailand reported that the Phnom Penh government and the Khmer Rouge people had agreed in principle to a ceasefire in Cambodia. The details of the agreement supported by Sihanouk will be announced when the representatives of Cambodia's different factions meet in Tokyo in early June.

In his announcement in Bangkok, Nguyen Co Thach also supported the suggestion made by Thailand that China, Vietnam, and Thailand would jointly hold talks on solving the Cambodian issue. He described the recent Vietnam-China negotiations held in Beijing on the normalization of Vietnam-China relations as successful.

Northeast Asia

Gorbachev Meets South Korean President

SK0506100890 Moscow International Service in Korean 0900 GMT 5 Jun 90

[Text] Soviet President Gorbachev is returning home after concluding his visit to the United States.

On the last day of his visit to the United States, President Gorbachev met businessmen in San Francisco and talked about broad prospects for Soviet-U.S. cooperation.

In a speech, a proposal for forging relations between California aerospace corporations and relevant Soviet enterprises was raised.

Comrade Gorbachev also met with South Korean President No Tae-u in San Francisco.

According to a report from our station reporter, the matter of bilateral relations and prospects for economic cooperation in Asia and the Pacific were discussed.

In his speech at Stanford University prior to this, Soviet President said: Since an end has been put to the cold war, there is no need to argue about who won it.

The Soviet Union and the United States assume specific responsibility for rapidly removing the mechanisms of East-West military confrontation.

President Gorbachev also met with former President Reagan.

What constitutes a major part of President Gorbachev's visit to the United States is talks with President Bush. The presidents of the two countries signed a series of important agreements, including a trade agreement.

A joint communique on basic conditions of a treaty on reducing strategic offensive weapons between the two powers in the future was adopted at the summit talks. This treaty is expected to be signed in Soviet-U.S. summit talks slated for the end of the year in Moscow.

Gorbachev Comments on ROK Ties

LD0506064190 Moscow TASS in English 0634 GMT 5 Jun 90

[Text] San Francisco June 5 TASS—Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev met briefly with South Korean President No Tae-u here before leaving for the Soviet Union.

Gorbachev said the meeting became possible "in the context of current changes in the Asia-Pacific region."

The Soviet president reiterated the Soviet Union's "principled positions on the peaceful reunification of North and South Korea" and welcomed the establishment of economic and cultural relations between South Korea and the Soviet Union.

He said these relations "have a considerable potential for development, taking into consideration the sides' mutual interest."

Speaking about the possibility of establishing diplomatic relations between the two countries, Gorbachev said "this issue may arise as bilateral ties develop and in the context of the general improvement of the political situation in the region and on the Korean peninsula."

Changing World Justifies Trade Ties With ROK

PM0406143590 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 2 Jun 90 p 3

[S. Maksimov article: "Has the Diplomats' Hour Come?"]

[Text] The world is changing. The present generation is witnessing a true revolution in international relations. This is largely the result of new approaches in Soviet foreign policy. Against this backdrop it is impossible not to notice the lack of serious progress in improving the political situation on the Korean peninsula.

Maintaining close political and economic relations with the DPRK, our country tried for a long time to ignore the growth and development of a serious political entity and potential economic partner south of the 38th parallel. The Soviet Union thereby artificially restricted its ability to play a more active role in reducing tension in the Korean peninsula.

The new thinking in Korean affairs is currently manifesting itself above all in the gradual establishment of trade relations with Seoul. This was promoted last year with the establishment of a mission of the USSR Chamber of Trade and Industry in the South Korean capital and a corresponding mission of the Korean Trade Promotion Corporation (KOTRA) in Moscow.

The next step in the development of relations between the two countries was prepared thanks to the existing accord on conferring consular functions on the trade missions. In practical terms, the Chamber of Trade and Industry and KOTRA missions are beginning to implement tasks of a diplomatic nature right now, and their staffers enjoy diplomatic privileges. This is also justified by expanding exchanges in the scientific, cultural, and sports spheres. By doing away with middlemen in trade, the USSR and South Korea have increased their returns from trade exchange, some of which used to go to third countries which helped us to overcome the political barriers.

The question arises: Has the time come to establish direct political dialogue with Seoul and thereby perhaps obtain further gains in our efforts to strengthen stability in the Korean peninsula and Asia and the Pacific region as a whole? It is also obvious that the establishment of normal diplomatic relations with South Korea would contribute to the development of economic ties. It is not out of place to mention here that many of our CEMA partners have already passed the stage of diplomatic recognition of South Korea and that the trade turnover between the PRC and South Korea is approximately five times the corresponding indicator in Soviet-South Korean relations.

At present in South Korea there is great interest in the USSR. This interest is evident in various spheres and among various sections of the population. In consolidating by means of diplomatic measures what has been achieved in our relations, the Soviet Union can only enhance its prestige in South Korea and the Pacific region.

Practical experience has shown that the removal of ideological fetters from foreign policy is by no means at variance with our national interests and does not mean that we are forgetting the interests of third countries. This approach is in line with common sense and with the entire course of world development.

Soviet Trade Festival Opens in Seoul

WA0406190690 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 29 May 90 Morning Edition p 5

[IZVESTIYA special correspondent S. Agafonov report: "Our Businessmen in Seoul"]

[Text] Seoul—Without exaggeration, a serious and important venture—a Soviet week, whose program contains a whole "package" of events promising to gather under its "banners" the flower of South Korean business—begins on 4 June in the South Korean capital. Although the organizers are attempting to avoid clamorous words, this will essentially be the first USSR national exhibition in a country with which relations were at the zero mark just two years ago.

Much has changed since then, and for Soviet businessmen today South Korea represents not a far-off piece of foreign trade exotica but a dynamic partner, contacts with which are not simply desirable but highly tempting. The pronounced growth of reciprocal commodity turnover has given rise to an entirely explicable surge of our businessmen's interest in Seoul and engendered many hopes, and it would not, most likely, be stretching the point to say that a South Korean boom is gathering momentum in the Soviet Union's "business circles," fed by notions concerning the possibilities of South Korean industry, technology, and finance which are sometimes in keeping with the truth, but are also, at times, the stuff of legend.

From this viewpoint the upcoming Soviet week in Seoul is doubly remarkable for the reason that the "crux" of the program will be a large-scale commercial exhibition, in which approximately 50 foreign trade organizations and enterprises of the USSR, several joint firms, a number of republic associations and cooperatives will take part. The seemingly customary "commercial exhibition" concept is unique for Seoul—for the first time all the participants in the exhibition will be participating in it not according to a departmental decision of the center but exclusively at their own volition and only for their own vital available foreign currency. Some 225 foreign currency rubles per square meter of exhibition space is a very costly pleasure, and the fact that many people have ventured to head for South Korea is a testimony to how strongly our businessmen believe in the "Korean lode".

This purely "applied" aspect, however, should not obscure another important point on the agenda of Soviet week—a special seminar organized at the request of South Korean business circles and devoted to the development of trade between our countries. It has been mutually agreed that the discussion there will be absolutely specific—on problems of legal regulation of the activity of foreign firms in the Union, joint ventures, and free economic zones. Our representatives will bring to Seoul seven fundamental papers reflecting approaches to all these aspects on the part of practically all interested Soviet departments. The discussion will undoubtedly be useful under the conditions of the information "vacuum" from which our potential partners suffer.

As for the "vacuum," it is mentioned particularly frequently in Seoul, incidentally. For the vast majority of South Korean companies and firms, Soviet economic realities remain terra incognita, not to mention the fact that the names of enterprises and associations coded in monstrous abbreviations tell local businessmen absolutely nothing. The sole channel in South Korea at the present time for obtaining meaningful information about the Soviet market is the Seoul office of our Trade and Industry Chamber, which is staffed by only six persons.

Let this "fly in the ointment," however, not spoil the general picture—the exhibition will be very interesting. This is to the great credit of its organizers—on the Korean side the State Trade Assistance Corporation with the Samsung company's sponsorship, and on ours, the Trade and Industry Chamber and the "Ekspotsentr" Association.

It is significant that for local businessmen, who are extraordinarily pragmatic and careful, as for the public at large, the Soviet week has already grown into something more than an ordinary commercial venture of interest only to specialists. Performances in Seoul of the Malyy Theater have just ended. A festival of Russian cuisine has opened in the Sheraton Hotel. Things Soviet are present in practically each issue of the local papers and in journal publications, and Russian heard on the streets no longer causes confusion, as it did a year ago, two years ago even more. "We are currently in a surprising and inimitable stage of first acquaintance and a period of a search for mutual understanding, which will lay the foundation for all future relations," Li Han-pin, president of the South Korean International Economic Cooperation Council influential economic organization, said. "Each event in our contacts therefore becomes special and very critical. From this viewpoint it is hard to overestimate the Soviet week in Seoul...."

South Korean Economic Delegation To Visit

LD3005165990 Moscow TASS in English 1507 GMT 30 May 90

[Text] Pyongyang May 30 TASS—A delegation of South Korean economists will pay a two-week visit to the Soviet Union, starting on June 2.

The specialists will explore ways to expand economic interaction between the Soviet Union and South Korea, YONHAP news agency reported today.

The delegation will meet Soviet representatives to discuss concluding agreements on investments, reciprocal taxation and payments, taking account of the fact that the USSR lacks hard currency to pay for South Korean deliveries.

Southeast Asia & Pacific

UN Cambodia Parley Maps Out Settlement Terms

LD3105142190 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 31 May 90 Second Edition p 7

[Report by own correspondent P. Tsvetov: "For An All-Embracing Settlement"]

[Text] Phnom Penh, 30 May—Representatives of the five UN Security Council member countries—the USSR, Britain, China, the United States, and France—have ended their fourth meeting in New York on the problems of a settlement in Cambodia. The document published at the end of it suggests that a new impetus has been given to further progress in the matter of resolving the prolonged regional conflict.

The document expresses firm confidence that only an all-embracing political settlement will bring lasting peace and stability to Cambodia. The meeting's participants stated that the settlement measures should include: monitoring the withdrawal of all foreign troops and ending outside military aid, an announcement of a long-term cease-fire, the creation of a Supreme National Council, and the guarantee of free and just elections to a Constituent Assembly under UN auspices. Guarantees of Cambodian independence, sovereignty, territorial integrity, neutrality, and national unity are also necessary, it was noted at the meeting.

For the first time in the course of these contacts, the five countries' representatives raised the question of the need to implement fundamental human rights and freedoms in Cambodia, which can only be interpreted primarily as a barrier to the possible restoration of the Pol Pot regime of genocide.

Mapping out the basic terms of a settlement, the New York meeting's participants allocated the main role in their implementation to the Cambodians themselves. They welcomed the accord on a meeting of representatives of the State of Cambodia amd the coalition government of Democratic Kampuchea in Tokyo at the beginning of June and expressed the wish that this should be a permanent dialogue. Representatives of the Cambodian sides were invited to hold joint discussions during the "Five's" next meeting on Cambodia, which takes place in Paris in the first half of July.

A joint quest for a way out of the conflict situation is the most rational option. Of course, the more participants there are in the talks, the longer the search for an accord will be, but, at the same time, the better the solution will be. Therefore, much will depend now on how the "five's" ideas are developed at the Cambodian sides' meetings in the near future.

Observer Views Sihanouk Cease-Fire Statement

BK0106090490 Moscow in Cambodian to Cambodia 1230 GMT 31 May 90

[Station observer Oleg Alekseyev's commentary]

[Text] Samdech Sihanouk, leader of the Cambodian opposition groups, stated that he would sign a cease-fire agreement during his coming meeting with Cambodian Prime Minister Hun Sen scheduled for 4-5 June in Tokyo. Our observer, Comrade Oleg Alekseyev, has the following comment:

If the two parties really sign a cease-fire agreement, this agreement will surely become a major step on the road toward normalizing the situation in Cambodia, a step that is necessary in light of the developments in that country. In this connection, I would like to recall some past events.

The complete withdrawal of Vietnamese troops from Cambodia in September 1989 was regarded by some as a signal to kick off violent military operations against Phnom Penh. Cambodia's western region thus became a theater of civil war. Those responsible for this war did not hide their ultimate goal which is to topple the Phnom Penh government and seize power in the country. Those who for a long time have fanned the flames of civil war have turned a deaf ear and blind eye to the call for a cease-fire made by Phnom Penh and governments of countries concerned. The few victories they had won in the first few months of attacks following the pullout of Vietnamese troops must have helped them do so. However, the time has come to look at the true situation with realism. The antagonists of Phnom Penh must have seen with their own eyes that they do not have enough strength to solve the Cambodian problem in their favor through the use of arms. It seems that this conclusion has led the leaders of the Cambodian opposition groups who still have some common sense to see the necessity of stopping military campaigns.

China's constructive attitude has also played a considerable role in this question. It is no secret that Vietnam and China recently held talks on the Cambodian problem. Observers drew attention to the fact that not long before he made that statement, Samdech Sihanouk had consulted with the Beijing leadership. Samdech Sihanouk said that he is ready to sign a cease-fire agreement in Tokyo. Certainly, this is good news. But we should not forget that although Sihanouk is a former king of Cambodia and is regarded as the leader of all Cambodian opposition factions, the situation remains complicated with the presence of the Khmer Rouge who form the most belligerent and powerful group among the Cambodian opposition parties. Will the Khmer Rouge agree to a cease-fire in Cambodia? We will get the answer to this question in just a few more days.

According to reports made available by various news agencies, although the talks in Tokyo will take place between Hun Sen and Norodom Sihanouk, the representatives of the other two Cambodian factions will also be there. It has been learned that in the Japanese capital, besides discussing the cease-fire, the Cambodian parties will discuss all issues related to a settlement of the situation, including general elections and the UN mission as mediator. However, the most important condition for normalizing the situation is the restoration of peace. We hope that this task, which responds most to the aspiration of the Cambodian people, will be settled once and for all at the Tokyo meeting.

Hun Sen Stops in Moscow, Talks With Official

PM0406152390 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 3 Jun 90 Second Edition p 7

[TASS report under the general heading: "Official Announcements"]

[Text] Hun Sen, member of the Kampuchean People's Revolutionary Party Central Committee Politburo, chairman of the Council of Ministers, and Cambodian foreign minister, was in Moscow 2 June en route to Tokyo.

Hun Sen had a friendly conversation with USSR Deputy Foreign Minister B.N. Chaplin.

U.S. Debates Ban on Import of Burmese Products

BK1905142190 Moscow in Burmese to Burma 1030 GMT 19 May 90

[Station commentary: "Anti-Myanmar Activities by U.S. Senators"]

[Text] The U.S. House of Representatives is currently debating a bill to ban imports of products of Burmese origin, according to information received. The bill has already been approved by the Senate. The station observer points out that in a historical post-war period, Myanmar [Burma] has taken a path of great responsibility this year. Only one week remains before multiparty general elections are held for the first time in 30 years. There is a lot of talk and discussions going on inside and outside Myanmar on the situation during the election period and on whether the elections will be held democratically or not. The future of Myanmar greatly depends on how the people of Myanmar and the world accept and react to the results of the upcoming 27 May elections.

In this kind of situation, the above activities of the U.S. senators could be regarded as an effort to put pressure on the Myanmar Government and other countries that have bilateral trade agreements with the Yangon [Rangoon] regime. According to remarks made by Burmese Ambassador U Nyunt Swe in Bangkok, the U.S. bill is just a political move and will have no effect on the economic situation in Myanmar. The ambassador also pointed out that the U.S. import value of Burmese goods, including teak, fish and fishery products, gems, and textiles worth $17 million is "nothing" compared to Myanmar's exports to Thailand. Some observers noted that the U.S. ban on Myanmar imports exceeded the level of relations of the two countries, Washington and Yangon [as heard], and is considered an interference in the relations between Myanmar and neighboring Thailand.

The ban will affect Thai companies trading and importing goods manufactured with raw materials bought from Myanmar. As we all know, last year the Myanmar Government gave logging concessions near the border areas between the two countries to Thailand. According to AFP, the Thai Government and Thai military leaders protested the above activities of the U.S. senators. The U.S. ban could also commercially effect the interests of businessmen from Singapore, Japan, and South Korea which resumed trade relations with the Myanmar Government earlier this year.

Reasons for Burmese Opposition Victory Examined

BK0206124890 Moscow in Burmese to Burma 1030 GMT 2 Jun 90

[(Andrey Pechisin) commentary: "Why the National League for Democracy emerged victorious in Burma"]

[Text] The TASS correspondent in Rangoon reports that telephone messages announcing the victory of candidates from the National League for Democracy [NLD] led by Daw Aung San Suu Kyi in last Sunday's [27 May] elections are arriving continuously at NLD headquarters. According to returns filed by NLD observers permitted to observe the vote counting, the NLD has won 390 seats out of 492 seats in the People's Assembly. A Soviet journalist, (Andrey Pechisin), reviews the initial elections returns from Burma:

It appears that the National Unity Party [NUP] and the military government never expected such results. It is well known that the NUP had the strongest financial base for the election campaign. According to diplomatic circles, each candidate from the NUP received 500,000 kyat just before the elections to buy votes. If one places the NUP election budget at 180 million kyat, there are grounds to believe that such a large sum of money had to come from public funds. The party placed considerable reliance on former Lanzin [Burma Socialist Program] Party officers to campaign in rural areas and in remote areas where the indigenous minorities live. They campaigned in these areas in support of minority parties which support the NUP. It is also learned that when the secretaries of the State Law and Order Restoration Council [SLORC] regularly visited these areas they campaigned along similar lines.

Despite all this, the strong aspirations for democratic change in Burma can be judged from the fact that even areas such as those in Rangoon where military families live voted for the NLD. Observers are saying that the Burmese people displayed their political maturity during the recent multiparty democratic elections. They voted for candidates who stood for public participation in state administration, personal freedom for citizens, and economic freedom for individuals.

It is clear that Daw Aung San Suu Kyi's qualifications played an important role in the NLD's victory. The daughter of the father of Burma's independence displayed broad-mindedness, courage, and honesty. She was not intimidated by threats and, because of these traits she soon became popular among the people. Even before being placed under house arrest, Daw Aung San Suu more than once faced threats to her freedom and life. As the criticism of Daw Aung San Suu Kyi by the military government intensified, her prestige among the people soared. When the authorities decided to try by force to prevent the participation of Daw Aung San Suu Kyi and U Tin U, another NLD leader, even those who doubted the NLD's ability to lead the reforms in Burma decided to vote for the NLD.

According to the latest reports, almost all public servants and nearly half the military personnel voted for the NLD. What will be the policy of this party which has the greatest potential to become the party in power? That question was answered concisely by U Saw Thein, a member of the NLD Central Executive Committee. He said the policy of the NLD would be directed toward serving the national interest, raising the people's living standard, allowing the people to enjoy their democratic rights, and making Burma a respected member in the community of nations.

Near East & South Asia

Israel Invites Gorbachev To View Resettlement

LD0406133490 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1200 GMT 4 Jun 90

[From the "Television news Service" program]

[Text] The Voice of America has broadcast a statement by the Israeli Labor Minister Peretz who, on behalf of the Israeli Government, invites the Soviet president to visit Judaea and Samaria, in order to see for himself that Israel is not sending repatriates from the USSR to the territories it controls—that means, you understand, the Palestinian territories occupied by Israel.

Israel's Jaffe Cited on Occupied Territories

PM3005094990 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 25 May 90 Morning Edition p 5

[Own correspondent report incorporating interview with Jaffe, secretary of the Mapam: "Israel: Escalation of Tension"]

[Excerpts] Cairo—The Near East is suffering acutely as a result of last Sunday's [20 May] tragedy. [passage omitted]

I asked L. Jaffe, secretary for international ties in the Israeli Mapam [United Workers Party], who is in Cairo at present, to comment on the prevailing situation.

"On the one hand, violence gives rise to more violence," he said. "But on the other, Sunday's tragedy was the detonator of an explosion that had long been waiting to happen. After all, there has been no political progress in resolving the conflict."

The unbearable tension of the situation is being exacerbated on both the Palestinian and the Israeli side, L. Jaffe believes. There is no doubt that the occupation is extremely damaging both to Israelis and to Israel as a whole: It is destroying the nation and the state.

As far as a resolution to the conflict is concerned, it is of course not to be found on the military plane. Clearly it is not easy to achieve, and many people in Israel are not ready for it or for the changes it would involve; but in the end compromise implies parting not with what you don't need, but with what you cherish.

So, as my interlocutor summed it up, the government needs to be ready, first, to talk to the Palestinians living inside and outside the occupied territories and with the PLO, and, second, to return the territories for the sake of the peace process.

Israeli Labor Party Paying for Stance in Cairo

TA2505200190 Moscow Radio Peace and Progress in Hebrew 1500 GMT 25 May 90

[Commentary by Dmitriy Prokofyev]

[Text] The Cairo session of Socialist International has ended. Among its resolutions was, for the first time, the statement that the establishment of a Palestinian state is a path toward a settlement in the Middle East. Observers have particularly stressed the fact that the Labor Party delegation did not vote against the proposal of this resolution.

This is what our commentator Dmitriy Prokofyev writes on the issue:

In fact, Egyptian Minister Butrus Ghali's remark that all the delegations voted in favor is imprecise. The head of the Labor Party, Shim'on Peres, did not vote. In a subsequent press interview, he said that he had refrained from voting in order not to remain alone, and so as not to underline even further Israel's complete isolation in this forum.

The impression, however, is that there was another consideration. Apparently, the resolutions of the Socialist International convention were the result of an Israeli-Arab compromise—perhaps even an Israeli-Palestinian one. The press reported nothing of this, of course, but it is a well-known fact that official documents at this level are formulated through consultations among the different delegations.

It is interesting to note that despite Israel's isolation at the Socialist International convention—isolation acknowledged even by the Labor Party leader—Mr. Peres managed to convince all the participants, including the Arabs, to vote for the resolution calling on the PLO to alter those clauses of the Palestinian convention which endorse terrorism. And again for the first time, Socialist International endorsed the resolution. It is absolutely clear that this Arab consent to refrain from voting against the resolution had a price which the Alignment had to pay.

And even this is not the main thing. If we scan the first interviews given by Mr. Peres after the convention of the Socialist International, we will realize that any criticism they contain is directed, first and foremost, toward the Likud, rather than the Arabs or the socialist parties that supported Palestinian independence.

The impression is that this is where the preparations for the early elections were launched; because even if Shamir contrives to form a narrow-based government, it will be feeble and unstable, and it will have to confront constant U.S. pressure. Conversely, the confrontation between the Alignment and the Likud—the Israeli political establishment's doves and hawks—can be uncompromising on one question only: the way toward the solution of the Palestinian problem. There are no significant differences between them, neither on questions of economy nor on their social policies. It should be understood that hitherto it was the Labor Party's unstable and vague policy on the Palestinian question that deprived it of success in elections. The Likud did and still does adhere to an unequivocal stand—uncompromising but clear—which offers explicit promises and unambiguous slogans.

The fact is that, in the face of the Likud's Palestinian policy, the Alignment had nothing to offer. However, Mr. Peres' recent declarations have made it plain that he attributes Israel's isolation at the Socialist International to the Likud's policy, rather than Labor's. Judging by the results of the Cairo vote, it seems that the Alignment leader intends to harness the machinery of the Socialist International to his attempt to exert pressure on Jerusalem hawks, and in order to change Israel's official policy to a more flexible stance.

Shamir Refusal of UN Mediation Denounced

LD2805151490 Moscow TASS in English 1415 GMT 28 May 90

[Text] Moscow May 28 TASS—By TASS political analyst Albert Balebanov:

Israeli Prime Minister Yitzhaq Shamir has objected to United Nations participation in the search for a solution to the Arab-Israeli conflict. Speaking on Jerusalem radio on Sunday [27 May], he said United Nations mediation "would not contribute to the peace process" in the region.

This represents not only a refusal to hold a U.N. sponsored international conference on the Middle East, but also a denunciation of proposals advanced by the Palestine Liberation Organisation (PLO), the United States and several other states and organisations to deploy U.N. troops or observers on the occupied territories. This arrogant stand shows that Tel Aviv intends to go on ignoring U.N. decisions on the Middle East. An Israeli spokesman told REUTERS that Israel "will not accept any Security Council ruling on the latest killing of Palestinians".

It is common knowledge that tension in the region was heightened after an Israeli serviceman shot eight innocent Palestinians. This compelled the United Nations to hold a special session of the Security Council in Geneva to discuss the situation. Most of its members called for U.N. observers to be stationed on the occupied Arab lands and for active U.N. intervention to find a peaceful settlement to the Arab-Israeli conflict.

Israel was able to ignore U.N. decisions with impunity because of U.S. connivance. But the situation seems to be changing. The U.S. Administration has established direct contact with the PLO in spite of Israeli protests, and has advanced its own plan to hold elections on the occupied territories and then organise direct negotiations between the PLO and Israel.

Washington has seconded the demand of the PLO and other countries for U.N. observers to be sent to the occupied territories. The Paris LE MONDE newspaper writes that "Systematic Israeli obstructions to constructive ideas increasingly irritate the United States and places Israel in growing international isolation, which was obvious during the Geneva special session of the U.N. Security Council".

The Shamir government's policy puts into question the sincerity of his assurances that he is striving to settle the regional conflict by peaceful means, through negotiations. If he really wanted such talks, they would have been started long ago. The government's actions are resented by many Israelis. It came to a head on Sunday when a 40,000-strong demonstration was held in Jerusalem to demand peaceful negotiations with the PLO.

The United Nations has proved its effectiveness in solving difficult international problems. As to the Arab-Israeli conflict, experience shows that it will hardly be resolved without U.N. assistance.

Arab Dialogue Organization Meets in Moscow

LD0406125990 Moscow TASS in English 1138 GMT 4 Jun 90

[By TASS correspondents Georgiy Shmelyov and Sergey Postanogov]

[Text] Moscow, June 4 (TASS)—The third meeting of the Soviet-Arab Dialogue Organisation opened in Moscow today to discuss the Soviet Union's relations with the Arab countries in the contemporary world.

The idea of holding Soviet-Arab dialogues was advanced three years ago by the Jordanian forum of the Arab thought. The first dialogue was held in Amman in 1988, and the second in Cairo in 1989.

The current third round is being co-sponsored by the Soviet Afro-Asian Peoples' Solidarity Committee and the USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of Oriental Studies. The forum was opened by Mikhail Kapitsa, chairman of the Soviet Afro-Asian Peoples' Solidarity Committee and director of the Institute of Oriental Studies, and Ahmad Hamrush, chairman of the Egyptian Afro-Asian Peoples' Solidarity Committee.

League of Arab States Assistant General-Secretary Lakhdar Ibrahimi read out a greeting from Jordanian Prince Hasan.

The three-day Moscow forum is being attended by prominent politicians and public figures, scientists, cultural workers as well as Soviet and Arab businessmen. They will discuss the common features and pecularities of the contemporary political processes taking place in the Soviet Union and the Arab world, the results and prospects of Soviet-Arab economic relations, as well as different aspects of the Soviet and Arab foreign policies in the light of the new political thinking.

Kuwait's KUNA Reports on Meeting

LD0406203790 Kuwait KUNA in English 1826 GMT 4 Jun 90

[Text] Moscow, June 4 (KUNA)—Chairman of the Soviet Afro-Asian Solidarity Committee Mikhail Kapitsa warned here Monday that extremism in the Middle East was threatening [an] outbreak of extensive military conflagration.

Kapitsa also expressed, in an inaugural address before the Soviet-Arab dialogue session which got under way here today, real concern over Israel's gross violations of Palestinian rights in the occupied Arab lands.

The official, who is just back from a fact-finding tour of Israeli-occupied Arab territories, recounted Israel's repressive practices and accused Israel of intentionally putting obstacles before a peaceful settlement and striving to prolong its occupation of Arab lands.

Kapitsa underlined that resolving the Palestinian issue was an important pre-requisite for a new contractual arrangement in the Middle East based on guaranteed peace, right of self-determination for all peoples in the region and the right of evolution for all peoples in the region and the right of evolution for all states within internationally-recognized borders.

The official, who is also member of the foreign relations committee in the Soviet parliament, strongly opposed use of Soviet Jews to implement Israel's sinister designs against the Palestinian population and called for elimination of weapons of mass destruction from the Mideast, adding human rights and free access to places of worship should be guaranteed in any peace package in the area.

The Soviet-Arab dialogue forum which opened today is the third gathering of its kind after a similar one in Amman in 1988 and a second in Cairo held a year later. It is co-sponsored by the Soviet Afro-Asian Solidarity Committee and the USSR Academy of Science's Institute of Oriental Studies.

Kapitsa, director of the Institute, expressed his country's readiness to support the Baker-Mubarak plan for starting a Palestinian-Israeli dialogue and reiterated importance of holding the international conference to work out a durable and just solution of the Middle East crisis.

In a message to the session, read on his behalf by Assistant Arab League Secretary Lakhdar Ibrahimi, Jordan's Crown Prince Hasan called for a new contractual relationship between the Arab states and the Soviet Union following the recent changes inside the Soviet Union and other East European countries and highlighted Arab concerns as result of Soviet Jewish emigration to occupied Arab lands.

Echoing his ideas, chairman of Egypt's Afro-Asian solidarity committee Ahmad Hamrush said Soviet-Arab relations should be reshaped to conform with the new realities in the Soviet Union and East Bloc nations, adding that after the perestroika, the traditional friendship based on previous ideological concepts is no more the suitable basis for future exchanges.

He hoped that a common understanding and stance on threats of soviet [word indistinct] immigration to Israel would evolve from the current Soviet-Arab dialogue.

The three-day Moscow forum is being attended by eminent politicians and public figures, scientists, cultural workers as well as Soviet and Arab businessmen.

They will discuss the common features and pecularities of the contemporary political processes taking place in the Soviet Union and the Arab world, the results and prospects of Soviet-Arab economic relations, as well as different aspects of the Soviet and Arab foreign policies in the light of the new political thinking.

Discussions Described

LD0406225690 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1522 GMT 4 Jun 90

[By TASS correspondent Sergey Postanogov]

[Text] Moscow, 4 Jun (TASS)—The first working day of the third Soviet-Arab dialogue was devoted to discussing 'the common and the specific' in contemporary political processes in the Soviet Union and the Arab world. It was opened today in Moscow.

"Federalization and democratization are the way out of the problems which are created by the ethnic differences in one country," said Sa'd al-Din Ibrahim, member of the Jordan delegation and general secretary of the Arabian thought forum. He presented his address 'The Ethnic Picture of the Arab World and Democratisation.' In his address he noted that the ethnic problems in Arab countries have similarity with such problems in the Soviet Union, and the discussion will help our countries in their search for solutions.

During the discussion special attention was paid to the problem of peace settlement in the Middle East. Egyptian writer Muhammad Sa'id Ahmad, participant in the dialogue, drew the attention of the forum's participants to the Palestinian problem. "The problem of peace in the Middle East will not be finally solved without the liquidation of occupation in all of the Arab lands," he stated.

Shaykh Tariq Bin-'Ala'-al-Din, member of Saudi Arabia's royal family, who was present at the Soviet-Arab dialogue, welcomed the new peace initiatives of the Soviet leadership, and expressed his interest in establishing economic ties with the USSR. In particular, he offered to open a permanent exhibition of Soviet products in Saudi Arabia, the profits from which would be channelled into the Soviet economy. He has also expressed readiness toward establishing the Soviet-Arabian bank, and making investments in the USSR on mutually beneficial terms.

"The Soviet people are the most reliable friends of the Arabs; the Arab countries have received a lot of help from the USSR and we are ready to be of use to you," said Nabil Amr, Palestine's ambassador to the USSR, in support of Shaykh Tariq Bin-'Ala'-al-Din's suggestion.

The first day of the Soviet-Arab dialogue has passed in fruitful discussions, useful for both the Arab world and the Soviet Union. Tomorrow the participants in the forum will continue their work. The main theme of the discussions will be Soviet-Arab economic ties in the present stage.

Paper Surveys Outcome of Baghdad Summit

PM0506092890 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 1 Jun 90 First Edition p 3

[Major R. Mustafin "Observer's Opinion" article: "Careful Thought and Responsibility Are Needed"]

[Text] The last week of May, preceding the Soviet-American summit meeting, which drew the main attention of the world public, was packed with important and dramatic events in the Near East:

—After the bloody attack by a former Israeli serviceman on a group of Palestinians in a suburb of Tel Aviv, there was a sharp deterioration in the situation in the region.

—Mass demonstrations by the Palestinian population in the occupied territories continue. In response the

Israeli authorities have launched a large-scale campaign of terror and violence.

—Disturbances swept through Palestinian camps on Jordanian territory.

—In a number of countries acts of terrorism were committed which, in the opinion of many observers, are a reaction to the murder of the Palestinians in Tel Aviv.

—A Security Council session took place in Geneva, convened at the request of Arab countries, to discuss the explosive situation in the region.

—Finally, an extraordinary conference of Arab heads of state and governments took place in Baghdad.

This event should be covered in more detail, especially since it occurred almost simultaneous with the meeting of the USSR and U.S. presidents which has begun in Washington. And not only because on the eve of the Arab summit conference M.S. Gorbachev and G. Bush sent messages to the participants.

The new character of East-West relations and the new political thinking generated by Soviet perestroyka have also created new conditions for the Near East. Objectively these conditions are more favorable for the start of a peace process in the region and the settlement of the age-old conflict. At the same time it is clear that the change is generating some new difficulties, too. For instance, Tel Aviv's intention of settling in the occupied territories the influx of Jewish immigrants that recently began to pour into Israel has caused profound concern among the Arabs.

It was this question that was the focus of attention for the participants in the Baghdad conference. The final resolution resolutely condemns Jewish immigration into Israel. It is described as a "serious threat to Arab national security." The document points out that the building of Israeli settlements in the occupied territories is unlawful, and appeals to the United Nations to formulate a mechanism of international monitoring of Israel's activity in this respect.

I would like to note that despite the fuss that has been made in some places over the Soviet Union's alleged share in the responsibility for the settlement of the new immigrants, the conference took a rather carefully considered view of the USSR's position. Egyptian President H. Mubarak noted that the Soviet Union is fully aware of the consequences of this problem, well understands the Arab demands, which are not contrary to human rights, and will take the Arab position into account. The greetings message from President M. Gorbachev to Iraqi President S. Husayn as chairman of the conference says that the settlement of immigrants in the occupied territories is an "open challenge to the world community and an attempt to block the peace process in the Near East and damage Soviet-Arab relations."

Attention was also focused on assessing the situation that has emerged in the Arab world and the influence of the current political changes in the world on the situation in the region. The conference participants expressed support for the Palestinian uprising and stressed the need to extend all-around assistance to the intifadah until the final aim is achieved—the creation of a Palestinian state. The final resolution contains sharp criticism of Israel's policy. It notes that the Israeli leadership is pursuing a course of aggression. The main responsibility for this rests with the United States, the document stresses. It gives Israel military and financial aid and provides political cover. The campaign of threats against Iraq and Libya was condemned.

The conference was certainly an event in the life of the Near East. The importance of the questions discussed is not open to doubt. But all the same, in my view, it could have been even more significant, had the leaders of Syria and Lebanon taken part. Disagreements between certain Arab countries should be pushed into the background, the Moroccan newspaper AL BAYANE rightly said. "Reconciliation between S. Husayn and H. al-Asad is far more pressing for us than reconciliation between them and Y. 'Arafat on the one hand, and Shamir and Peres on the other," the Egyptian weekly MAYO writes.

Unfortunately, once again the Arab countries were unable to overcome the serious contradictions in their own camp. This is apparently why the conference confined itself to reasserting that the way out of the Lebanon crisis is to implement the Al-Ta'if agreements.

I also think that the conference was not in every respect appropriate to the changed situation in the region. It was expected to lead to the start of practical steps to settle the conflict and the formulation of a united strategy. This is all the more important in that on the eve of the conference the United States appealed to Arab heads of state to recognize Israel and renounce their support for the idea of holding an international conference on the Near East. And this question was not, in my opinion, adequately dealt with at the conference.

One last point that I would like to note. The Near East countries, having nuclear missile and chemical weapons at their disposal, have already approached a dangerous threshold which it would be madness to cross, not only for themselves but for the whole world. In this connection it is clearly desirable to renounce the sometimes excessively bellicose rhetoric and even outright saber-rattling. Now more than ever before, careful thought and responsibility are needed. The Near East must open the doors to the new thinking.

Arab Summit Praised for 'Realism,' 'Restraint'

PM0506094990 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 2 Jun 90 Second Edition p 7

[Special correspondent V. Belyakov dispatch: "Under the Slogan of Solidarity. Results of the Arab Summit Conference"]

[Text] Baghdad, 1 Jun—The flags of the Arab League countries fluttered over the Palace of Congresses in the Iraqi capital for three days. This was where sittings of the extraordinary inter-Arab summit conference devoted to the development of events in the region were being held. The adopted declaration reflected the results.

Thus, the conference welcomed the staunchness of the Arab people of Palestine, who are under Israeli occupation and have stirred the uprising against the Israeli authorities' terror despite the daily casualties. The document underlines the need to offer the Palestinian people material and political support in their struggle to liberate their homeland and create an independent state on their national territory, with the capital in Jerusalem, under the leadership of their sole legitimate representative—the PLO.

The conference participants condemned the organized Jewish immigration into the occupied Palestinian and "other Arab territories" and demanded that steps be taken to curb it.

The declaration also points out that the United States, which gives Israel comprehensive backing, bears the main responsibility for the absence of a settlement in the Near East.

The conference advocated the simultaneous elimination of all types of mass-destruction weapons in the Near East.

Chronic problems such as Lebanon were also considered at the conference. Last October's al-Ta'if agreement on a peaceful settlement in Lebanon was approved and an appeal made for a fund to be set up to revive that country.

The conference participants did not skirt global problems. They welcomed the process of lessening international tension, disarmament, and the trend toward basing relations between states on a balance of interests. At the same time the declaration enshrined the fact that, from the Arabs' viewpoint, the changes taking place in the world have not only positive but also negative aspects. They are, obviously, referring above all to immigration into Israel and also to the fact that virtually all East European countries have recently restored their relations with Tel Aviv, relations which were broken off in protest against the 1967 aggression.

The Baghdad conference took place under the slogan of Arab solidarity. But it should be noted that Syrian and Lebanese representatives did not attend. This somewhat reduced the significance of the decisions adopted. Admittedly, on his way home Egyptian President H. Mubarak visited Damascus, where he discussed the decisions adopted in Baghdad with H. al-Asad and the prospects for normalizing Syrian-Iraqi relations.

It was decided, notably, to hold annual summit meetings—in November—with a view to making inter-Arab dialogue systematic. The first meeting of this kind is scheduled to be held this year in the Egyptian capital. By and large the Baghdad meeting was notably distinguished by realism and restraint. The Arabs demonstrated their desire for peaceful dialogue to resolve the acute problems in the region.

Andreyev Views Iran's Stand on Baghdad Summit

NC3005101890 Moscow in Persian to Iran
1700 GMT 29 May 90

[Yuriy Andreyev commentary from "The World Today" feature]

[Text] As previously reported, the extraordinary conference of Arab leaders opened in Baghdad on Monday. The tight knot of unsolved problems in the Middle and Near East was the political motive behind this meeting. Our commentator Yuriy Andreyev discusses Iran's stand on the Baghdad conference:

It is very obvious that Tehran is watching closely to see what is happening in the Hall of Congresses where almost all the Arab flags are hoisted. The decisions adopted during the Arab summit will apparently have a serious impact on the regional situation and cannot be ignored by the Islamic government, especially since a solution of the Iran-Iraq problem will also be discussed in the Iraqi capital.

Official Tehran is still refraining from statements on the Baghdad conference. But it is obvious that Iran's approach to this gathering is not uniform. As we know, the views of the current Iranian leadership and of the heads of Arab states on a number of issues conform in various ways. For example, Tehran is one of the full-fledged opponents of Israel on the international scene. In the confrontation between Tel Aviv and the Arab world, Iran definitely supports the Arabs. The Islamic government also supports the Palestinian uprising which is continuing in the occupied territories. Finally, Tehran regards with understanding the issue of interest to the Arabs—the settlement of the new influx of Jewish emigrants from East Europe and the Soviet Union in territories that belong to the Palestinians.

Meanwhile, Iran apparently has not forgotten its serious differences of opinion with the Arab leaders who are meeting in Iraq. It is not accidental that the TEHRAN TIMES, which is close to the government, carried an editorial describing the reports from Baghdad as disturbing and calling on the Palestinians and all Arab Muslims to open their eyes and prevent the betrayal of their interests.

It is obvious that Tehran's extremely cold approach to the extraordinary Arab summit is no accident. The Iranian leadership is, first and foremost, not happy with the venue of the conference. Facts show that Tehran believes that the choice of Baghdad was tantamount to political and moral assistance to the Iraqi regime and Saddam Husayn. The nonparticipation in the Arab summit of any representatives of Syria—a country which is Baghdad's major enemy and one of Iran's closest allies among the Arab countries—is extremely good proof of this.

Tehran does not support the stand of the majority of the Arab countries on the tragic incidents in Lebanon. As we know, the Islamic government and the pro-Iranian forces in Lebanon rejected the national reconciliation agreement which was drawn up in al-Ta'if late last year by the Arab League and members of the Lebanese parliament. Iran is trying, as before, to strengthen its presence in Lebanon; and this has met with an extremely negative reaction in many Arab countries.

Moreover, Tehran is anxiously waiting for the outcome of the debates during the extraordinary Arab summit on ending the state of war between Iran and Iraq. It seems that the Iranian leadership is worried that Baghdad will be able to pave the ground for a joint Arab communique which may place Iran in an unfavorable situation.

In short, amidst the restraint that the Iranian officials are trying to show, one can see signs of anger which Tehran is not succeeding in hiding.

Iranian Envoy, Belonogov Discuss Soviet Jews

LD2505175290 Tehran IRNA in English 1555 GMT 25 May 90

[Text] Moscow, May 25, IRNA—Tehran-Moscow relations and the situation in the Middle East were discussed in a meeting between Iran's ambassador to Moscow Naser Heirani-Nobari and Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister Aleksandr Belonogov here Friday.

Nobari denouncing Zionist regime's brutal attacks on Palestinian Muslims said the Islamic Republic of Iran condemns settlement of the Soviet Jews in the Palestinian occupied lands and objects influx of Soviet Jews to the occupied territories. He called for effective measures by Moscow to stop the influx.

The Soviet official expressing his country's dissatisfaction with the migration of Soviet Jews to the occupied lands said the Soviets term as "illegal" Israel's policy on settling the Jews in Arab lands and believe, "this policy contradicts international undertakings of that government."

The Soviet official said his country took the initiative to put forth the issue of migration of Soviet Jews and their settlement in the occupied regions to the U.N. Security Council. Moscow will back the resolution to be issued by the Security Council in this respect, he added.

Prospects for Iran-Iraq Peace Talks Analyzed

NC2905124690 Moscow Radio Peace and Progress in Persian to Iran 1530 GMT 26 May 90

[Station commentary]

[Text] The Iranian Armed Forces Command has decided to stage large-scale military maneuvers in the southwest and in Khuzestan province. These maneuvers are to commemorate the eighth anniversary of the liberation of the port of Khorramshahr, an Iranian border city, from Iraqi occupation.

The liberation of Khorramshahr was not merely a military (?feat). This incident filled the hearts of the Iranians with pride and is a constant stimulus of their patriotic sentiments. After all, this incident is one important (?aspect) of a war which has ended; that is, the revival of Iran's sovereignty over Khuzestan, which was the victim of an onslaught by the Iraqi Armed Forces.

However, today some persons are inclined to capitalize on the Iranians' patriotic sentiments in order to encourage a militaristic spirit and to exacerbate the situation in the Persian Gulf region. In any case, this is happening on the eve of the resumption of peace talks to be held under the UN aegis. These talks are aimed at extricating the trend for a political solution of the conflict between the two countries from the present impasse.

As General Hoseyn Hasani-Sa'di, the commander of the Iranian Ground Forces, claims, eight years of war have resulted in his country's having obtained rich and militarily important experience. The Iranian leadership is even willing to place this experience at the disposal of other Islamic governments. According to the remarks of this general, the military capability of the Armed Forces of Iran has doubled since 22 September 1980. Iran's ordnance industries have produced tank motors, spare parts for small-barrel guns, and other military equipment.

It appears that the aim of such utterances is to impress on Iraq that Iran is not sitting idle as far as military preparations are concerned. However, is this necessary for the success of the peace talks? After all, the convocation of peace talks only became possible when the two sides realized the improbability of their being able to resolve their differences on the battlefield. Both countries did attain some military victories in the course of the war. For Iran, it was the liberation of Khorramshahr, and for Iraq it was the liberation of the al-Faw peninsula.

However, these victories had no decisive significance. Neither of the two countries could achieve final victory. Today, it is far more important to look at the liberation of Khorramshahr by the Iranian Armed Forces from a different perspective. This incident in May 1982 could have led to the end of the war which, in turn, could have resulted in the deliverance of hundreds of thousands of Iranians and Iraqis. Thus, the major material and cultural values, the result of the efforts of the two nations, could have been saved from destruction.

The former Iranian leaders, however, did not content themselves with the liberation of their territory from Iraqi occupation; this victory fanned their military flights of fancy. The military operations were carried into Iraqi soil and as a result the war dragged on for another six years, to the (?detriment) of the two countries.

The lessons to be gleaned from the above is that war which exceeds the confines of the defense of national sovereignty and is carried on for territorial expansion to impose one's own system on other nations is criminal and lethal. To resolve issues by force is a policy without any future. Only a genuine desire for peace and good-neighborliness and a willingness to iron out differences by political means can ensure security and prosperity for the Iranian and Iraqi nations.

Significance of Iran-Iraq Correspondence Noted

NC2905083390 Moscow Radio Peace and Progress in Persian to Iran 1530 GMT 28 May 90

[Station commentary]

[Text] Baghdad and Tehran have exchanged letters in which the stances of the two sides regarding bilateral relations and the outstanding regional issues are detailed. Such letters are habitually exchanged between countries which have relations; this is a normal phenomenon. However, the situation with regard to Iran and Iraq is different.

The territorial disputes which have not yet been resolved are bound to have an impact on mutual relations. Until recently the two countries were embroiled in a sanguinary war as a result of these disputes. Following the cease-fire, the confrontation between Iran and Iraq became a diplomatic and propagandistic one. In this context, their efforts to explain one another's stances through letters has a special significance.

This is the first step in direct political negotiations between the two sides. It is a (?sign) that they have decided to explore all means to attain a final peace. It could be said that, even apart from this, Iran and Iraq were carrying on peace talks under UN supervision. However, one process will not hinder the other. The UN mediation will ensure that the peace talks do not deviate from the subject of the implementation of the UN Security Council Resolution 598. This is the practical assistance accorded to the participants in the peace talks, as a result of the deep desire of the international community for the security and cooperation of the countries of the Persian Gulf region.

This has also laid greater responsibility on the Iranian and Iraqi representatives in the talks. However, facts indicate that under the UN aegis the mutual (?trust) of the two parties necessary for resolving reciprocal disputes through political means seems to be slow in coming. [Words indistinct] one of the two sides endeavors to exert psychological and propaganda pressure to gain the upper hand. There is immense suspicion and distrust between them.

In such circumstances, there is no substitute for personal contacts between the leaders of the two countries and the exchange of letters between them regarding issues which are the source of conflict. The strong (?motivation) for political talks between Iran and Iraq lies within the UN framework. Once again it is emphasized that the exchange of correspondence is only a (?preliminary) step, taken at a time when tension persists between Iran and Iraq. The tone of the letters, especially that of the Iranian letter, reveals the lack of reciprocal understanding on the part of the two sides. Despite this, Mr. Raja'i-Khorasani, member of the Islamic Majlis Foreign Affairs Committee, believes that the Iraqi letter is a sincere proof of the [words indistinct] response.

Such an assessment by an Iranian parliamentarian regarding the Iraqi diplomatic move addressed to Iranian Government officials, basically regarding the [words indistinct]. Particularly in light of the expected commencement of the next stage of the Iran-Iraq peace talks, the exchange of letters by the two countries is of immense significance. This provides motivation for the pursuit of the talks beyond the stage of a stalemate, but it is essential that the two countries should strengthen their determination to eliminate mutual mistrust and suspicion.

Commentary on Iraq's Second Letter

NC2905154490 Moscow in Persian to Iran 1500 GMT 28 May 90

[Station commentary from "The World Today" feature]

[Text] Reports from Tehran indicate that the National Security Council met on 26 May under the chairmanship of President 'Ali Akbar Hashemi-Rafsanjani in the Iranian capital. During this meeting, the Iraqi leadership's second letter to the Islamic government of Iran was discussed. Our commentator writes on this:

This is the second letter from the Iraqi leadership to the Iranian Government which is devoted to ending the state of war between the two countries. The first letter was sent about a month ago and was favorably assessed by the Iranian leadership. The Iranian mass media reported on a series of meetings among the Iranian leadership during which Saddam Husayn's letter was discussed. 'Ali Akbar Hashemi-Rafsanjani, in turn, pointed to the manifestation of some [word indistinct] and good intentions by Iraq. However, until now the contents of the first letter and especially of the second letter have not been officially available to the public.

Meanwhile, reports sometimes appear in the press from which one can glean certain views on the current situation of Iranian-Iraqi contacts. A high-ranking Iraqi representative stated in an interview with the correspondent of a Kuwaiti newspaper that Saddam Husayn's letter sent on 1 May consisted of a proposal for seizing the favorable opportunity that has recently emerged in order to end the two countries' border disagreements. The TEHRAN TIMES, in turn, has said that the letter proposed a summit to discuss ways to emerge from the abyss into which the two countries' peace talks have been plunged. Kuwait's AL-SIYASAH wrote that the Iraqi leader is ready to meet with 'Ali Akbar Hashemi-Rafsanjani in Mecca and to start the new course of talks which will be based on the 1975 Algiers pact. Moreover, diplomatic sources have said that Saddam Husayn has proposed a new approach be adopted on the sovereignty over the Shatt al-'Arab.

It seems that the Iraqi leadership's second letter complements the major views expressed in its first letter. Baghdad has noticed Tehran's positive reaction to (?the contents) of the 1 May letter. For example, Iraqi Foreign Minister Tariq al-'Aziz told correspondents that positive steps have been taken to form the basis of the good understanding needed to solve the problem. He also did not rule out the possibility of direct talks between the two countries in the near future.

The fact that a second letter was sent shows that both sides are exerting greater efforts to establish normal joint relations and are trying not to harm the favorable atmosphere that has recently been created between Tehran and Baghdad. It is very clear and obvious that the process of establishing joint normal relations will call for even more efforts. In addition to the dispute over the Shatt al-'Arab, the problems pertaining to occupied territories belonging to Iran and to the prisoners of war continue to exist. Nevertheless, the most important point is that apparently the dialogue and talks between Iran and Iraq are gradually being put on the right course.

Further on Correspondence

NC3105204590 Moscow in Persian to Iran 1700 GMT 30 May 90

[Yuriy Andreyev commentary from "The World Today" feature]

[Text] Esteemed listeners. Mehdi Karrubi, the Iranian Majlis speaker stated that Iran does not rule out the possibility of a meeting between 'Ali Akbar Hashemi-Rafsanjani and Saddam Husayn.

In general, this remark by the Iranian parliamentary speaker is not unexpected. Earlier reports about the possibility of a high-level Iran-Iraq meeting have been disseminated in both countries' press. However, now these reports have been confirmed officially. According to Mehdi Karrubi, the proposal for a meeting between the presidents of the two countries has been explained in the letter by Saddam Husayn.

The Iraqi leadership has sent two letters to the Islamic Government of Iran incorporating a call for an end to the state of war between Iran and Iraq. High-level talks may prove instrumental in its attainment. The speaker of the Majlis said that if the two sides display good will such a meeting would be possible. However, Karrubi himself is not overly optimistic about such a meeting. In any case, Baghdad has affirmed its readiness for talks on a high level. According to the ASSOCIATED PRESS, the PLO has offered to act as mediator for preliminaries and the convocation of the talks between 'Ali Akbar Hashemi-Rafsanjani and Saddam Husayn. The PLO's spokesman in Baghdad said that probably the meeting between the two presidents would be held in the next few weeks. It is expected that PLO leader Yasir 'Arafat will visit Tehran and present specific proposals in this regard in the Iranian capital.

Meanwhile the Iraqi president said at the extraordinary session of the Arab countries' leaders' summit that he feels hopeful about changes in Baghdad-Tehran ties and about initiating talks on the basis of reciprocal rights of the two countries. According to the reports received, the two sides have embarked on a practical implementation of their plans. For example, in response to the first letter by Saddam Husayn, Iran suggested that direct talks should be held between representatives of the two countries.

As Mehdi Karrubi said, Iran and Iraq have not yet named their representatives, but this will be done shortly. Thus it appears the trend of resolving the Iran-Iraq disputes is being taken out of its state of stagnation, and it is actually being hoped that a peace accord will be signed between the two countries. Obviously only on the basis of mutual tolerance and by traversing a prolonged and difficult road can this objective be achieved.

Tehran and Baghdad, above all, should reach a consensus on border issues, and all differences regarding the Shatt al-'Arab waterway, the Iranian occupied territories, should be resolved. The issue of POW's, whose number exceeds 100,000 and who have been waiting for a long time for decisions on their fate, is also of immense importance.

Esteemed listeners, the next few weeks will be fraught with intense pressure and activity for Iranian and Iraqi diplomats. The trend of events has assumed a dynamic form and it is not too farfetched that fundamental changes may come about in the relations of the two countries.

It seems that Tehran and Baghdad are willing to exchange arms for the olive branch of peace.

Reports on Iranian Hostages' Fate Discussed

NC0106124690 Moscow in Persian to Iran 1700 GMT 31 May 90

[Yuriy Andreyev commentary from "The World Today" feature]

[Text] Dear listeners: Morteza Sarmadi, the Islamic Republic of Iran Foreign Ministry spokesman said on 30 May that the four Iranian hostages who were abducted in Lebanon in 1982 are alive. The White House had announced earlier that according to the information received by the United States, they were not alive.

The issue of the Iranian hostages in Lebanon is extremely complicated and ambiguous. The fate of the Iranian citizens who disappeared in 1982 in Beirut during the Israeli aggression against Lebanon is now a matter of speculation. According to most reports, three Iranian diplomats and one chauffeur who was also a bodyguard were reported missing at that time in Lebanon. However, other sources stated that three Iranian diplomats and one journalist were abducted.

In addition, other reports stated that two Iranian diplomats, one journalist and one chauffeur were reported missing in Beirut. The reports themselves are not very clear, much less the fate of the missing persons. None of the terrorist organizations have assumed responsibility for the abduction of these four persons. However, according to Iranian claims, these four individuals were abducted at the behest of Tel Aviv by the Lebanese Christian groups. Tehran has repeatedly (?asked) about the fate of these hostages. However, up to now, no reliable reports have been received about their fate.

Some months ago, during the (?negotiations for) the American hostages, it was [words indistinct]. At that time, Washington officially thanked Iran for its assistance in the release of American hostages and George Bush said at a press conference that he had instructed the American intelligence organization to obtain information on Iranians abducted in Lebanon.

On 30 May, the White House announced the results of this venture. White House spokesman Marlin Fitzwater told correspondents that the Iranian citizens who disappeared in 1982 in Lebanon have been killed. Fitzwater said that we have made immense efforts to obtain this data and we are certain now that the abducted Iranians are not alive.

Despite this, the Americans have not been successful in ending the issue of Iranian hostages. On 30 May, Iranian Foreign Ministry spokesman Morteza Sarmadi said that these persons are alive. According to Morteza Sarmadi, the Iranian Government has obtained this information from reliable sources. He did not divulge these sources. The Iranian Foreign Ministry spokesman said that this news has made us very happy and we will continue our efforts to obtain information regarding our hostages.

Tehran and Washington are giving contradictory reports while both insist on the veracity of their respective statements. Conflicting statements are [words indistinct]. The Iranian hostages [words indistinct] interrogation from both sides. At present it is difficult to say who is right. One cannot even speculate whether the truth will transpire in the near future. However, to use the catastrophic fate of human beings in order to attain ulterior motives is an unethical act.

Soviet Official Weighs Iran Revolution Impact

LD0306193490 Tehran Domestic Service in Persian 1630 GMT 3 Jun 90

[Text] Mr. (Saber Khasanov), deputy head of the Soviet Caucasus and Transcaucasus Clergy Office, who is heading a religious delegation to Iran to participate in the ceremonies marking the first anniversary of the demise of Imam Khomeyni—may God accept his soul in paradise—said in an interview with the central news unit in Tabriz:

Some 10,000 of the eager inhabitants of Soviet Azerbaijan applied to travel to Iran to be present at these ceremonies, but, due to administrative difficulties in this country, they have failed to make the journey. He added: On the occasion of the anniversary of the demise of his holiness, Imam Khomeyni—may his soul be sanctified—three days of public mourning have been declared in the Muslim-inhabited regions of Soviet Caucasus and Transcaucasus; three days of public mourning will be maintained.

With regard to the impact of the Islamic revolution of Iran in the Soviet Union, he said: Imam Khomeyni does not belong only to Iran. He emphasized: Imam Khomeyni, through his leadership, strengthened Islamic movements throughout the world and, for the Soviet Union and the Islamic revolution of Iran, was a turning point for the USSR Muslims to find their true selves and return to their Islamic nature; the reconstruction and reopening of mosques, renewed publications of the Koran, and the establishment of the theological school of Azerbaijan, can all be counted as the results of the Islamic revolution of Iran.

Sub-Saharan Africa

Lukyanov Receives Lenin Prize Committee Members

PM3105143790 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 31 May 90 Second Edition p 7

[TASS report: "Reception Held"]

[Text] On 30 May USSR Supreme Soviet Chairman A.I. Lukyanov received the members of the International Lenin Peace Prize Committee in the Kremlin.

Academician B.Ye. Paton, chairman of the International Lenin Peace Prize Committee, talked about the first session of the new committee, during which the nominees for the prize were considered. In accordance with the results of a secret ballot, the committee decided to award the International Lenin Peace Prize for 1990 to N. Mandela—courageous fighter against the apartheid regime and prominent Southern African politician and public figure.

Greeting the committee members, A.I. Lukyanov stressed the significance of the international prize that bears V.I. Lenin's name. It was noted that the new prize regulations, approved by the USSR Supreme Soviet

Presidium in December 1989, make it possible to assess more fully and more objectively a particular figure's contribution to upholding the cause of peace and general human values and interests. In connection with the committee's 1990 award, the USSR Supreme Soviet chairman said that Nelson Mandela is truly a living legend. Not only in his homeland, but far beyond it he has earned enormous respect among all who cherish the ideals of peace and equality, freedom and humanity.

K.Yu. Lavrov, E. Lanz (Austria), A.M. Ridiger, S.Ye. Savitskaya, O.O. Suleymenov, and Afework Tekle (Ethiopia) participated in the meeting, which took place in an atmosphere of warmth and cordiality.

Lukyanov Praises Peace Prize Award to Mandela

LD3005194190 Moscow TASS is English 1444 GMT 30 May 90

[Text) Moscow May 30 TASS—South African nationalist leader Nelson Mandela has been awarded the International Lenin Peace Prize for 1990, Academician Boris Paton, chairman of the Peace Prize Committee, announced during a meeting in the Kremlin today with Supreme Soviet Chairman Anatoliy Lukyanov.

Lukyanov welcomed the decision, stressing the sigificance of the international prize named after the founder of the Soviet state, Vladimir I. Lenin.

He observed that the new prize regulations, endorsed by the Supreme Soviet Presidiumin December 1989, make it possible to evaluate more fully and objectively nominees' contribution to peace and universal human values and interests.

Commenting on the Lenin Peace Prize Committee's decision, Lukyanov emphasised that Mandela is truly a living legend.

"Not only at home, but far beyond its bounds, has he won immense respect among all who cherish the ideas of peace and equality, freedom and humanism," Lukyanov said.

Academician Affirms Support for African Allies

EA2705222190 Moscow International Service in Amharic 1530 GMT 23 May 90

[Interview with Dr. Aleksey Voslyer, deputy director of African Studies at the USSR Academy of Science, by unidentified interviewer]

[Excerpts] What does the future of the USSR's relations with African countries look like? The perestroyka movement initiated in the USSR is under way. What type of pressures will it cause at home and on cooperation with Africa? Dr. Vasilyev said:

[Begin recording] [Vasilyev in Russian fading to Amharic translation] In fact the situation amounts to freeing USSR-African cooperation from ideological pressures. It is the Soviet leadership's wish that relations with African countries should be based on officially known international rules and principles. We should take into consideration our interests and those of other countries. The scale to measure our friendship with other countries should not be empty slogans and words, as before. It should not be based on quotations by one or the other leader from the works of Marx or Lenin. We shall stop our belief that there are two opposing camps. [passage omitted]

[Question] Would the USSR have balanced relations with all African countries if in its foreign policy it leaves the ideological gauge of friendship aside? Would this not alienate her former friends and allies? This is an issue for most of the African countries. What is your view on this issue?

[Vasilyev] I have no doubt that the USSR will continue her cooperation with her former friends. [passage omitted]

[Question] It is evident that there are some unclear issues in the light of relations between the USSR and Africa in the military field. Though these facts are confidential, Western sources have not stopped speculating on this issue. But their speculations cannot be far from the truth. Since you are a foreign affairs expert in the Supreme Soviet, what is your stand on this issue?

[Vasiliyev] I will not refrain from advising the deputies to expose the facts to the public. Although, I do not have any correct figures or evidence, I am sure that African governments have repaid most of their debts for arms. The reduction in the supply of weapons will assist the recovery of African countries. It is due to a lack of understanding that we were accused of not giving enough food aid to Africa when we have our own food problems. If there is any food aid that we are giving to famine victims in Mozambique, Ethiopia, or any other country it is minimal compared to other countries' donations. What is good for us is to work out modalities that would enable us to create mutual cooperation with African countries rather than sever our relations with them.

We should concentrate rather on peace efforts than on the military build-up. The aim of the arms sales were for defense against external enemies. Since we have given up the policy of confrontation in the political and ideological fields, we have opened the way for the elimination of military pacts. This again, gives way to economic and social cooperation. [end recording]

East Europe

Landsbergis News Briefing in CSFR Reported

PM0406135390 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 2 Jun 90 p 3

[Own correspondent Ye. Chernykh dispatch: "Private Visit"]

[Text] Prague—V. Landsbergis, chairman of the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet, has visited Czechoslovakia at the personal invitation of V. Havel. During the visit he met with the CSFR [Czech and Slovak Federative Republic] President and Foreign Minister J. Dienstbier, representatives of the Czechoslovak-Lithuanian Society and the Association of Lithuanians Living in Czechoslovakia, and students. At a press conference Landsbergis emphasized that in a situation where the Soviet Union is trying to blockade the republic not just economically but also politically, the visit to Czechoslovakia is a significant step. He noted that the possibility of CSFR mediation in talks between Moscow and Vilnius, which was recently proposed by V. Havel, has not been discussed since Moscow failed to respond to this proposal. Asked what specifically Czechoslovakia had offered to Lithuania, Landsbergis replied the following: "You can see what Czechoslovakia is doing. And you will see what it will do." According to him, during his meeting with J. Dienstbier the first step was taken toward establishing a commission of experts from both states. Landsbergis viewed with skepticism the suggestion that the talks between the presidents of the USSR and the United States might facilitate the solution of the problem of the Baltic republics' independence. He associates the possibility of a change in relations with Lithuania with the election of B. Yeltsin as chairman of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet, since the latter has condemned the blockade of the republic.

The Czechoslovak press coverage of Landsbergis' visit was rather reserved.

Gorbachev Appoints Shikin Envoy to GDR

LD0206155990 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1335 GMT 2 Jun 90

[Text] Moscow, 2 June (TASS)—USSR President Mikhail Gorbachev, has appointed Gennadiy Shikin as the USSR ambassador to the GDR and released him from his duties as the USSR ambassador to the Republic of Austria. Shikin worked in the USSR embassies in the SFRY and the FRG. In 1976-1986 he worked in the apparatus of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. In 1986-1990 he was the USSR ambassador to Austria.

Vyacheslav Kochemasov was released from his duties as the USSR ambassador in the GDR in connection with his retirement on pension.

Polish Historian Interviewed on Pact Issues

PM0106091790 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 30 May 90 First Edition p 3

[Interview with Colonel A. Marcinkowski, department chief at the Polish Army Military History Institute, by Lieutenant Colonel V. Kharchenko under the rubric "Topical Interview"; place and date unspecified: "Looking Into the Future"—first paragraph is introduction]

[Excerpts] For 35 years now the Warsaw Pact—the collective defensive alliance of East European countries—has reliably served the cause of strengthening peace and international security. Lieutenant Colonel V. Kharchenko discusses the past, present, and future of this military-political organization with Colonel A. Marcinkowski, department chief at the Polish Army Military History Institute and doctor of historical sciences. [passage omitted]

[Kharchenko] The following question was voiced in a recent public speech by an official representative of the Polish republic: Why are the allied forces always headed by Soviet generals and why can't a representative of another Warsaw Pact state be appointed to this post? In your view is this a question of principle?

[Marcinkowski] In my view, the appointment of a representative of any other allied state to the post of commander in chief of the Warsaw Pact Joint Armed Forces would not impinge upon the USSR's interests in the least. Especially as this very possibility is provided for by documents regulating the activity of the Warsaw Pact's military organization. The East European countries' autonomy has grown appreciably with the start of perestroyka in the USSR. And the military sphere must not constitute an exception. The sooner we arrive at considered and well thought-out decisions here, the stronger and more united our defensive alliance will be.

[Kharchenko] Everything would seem to be clear so far as the immediate future is concerned. But what if we look further into the future?

[Marcinkowski] Mikhail Gorbachev's proclamation of the new political thinking, the efforts made by Warsaw Pact states to construct an all-European home, and the priority of common human values which they have declared have substantially lessened tension both in the world and in Europe. Nevertheless I do not consider it superfluous to stress that this process, like the unification of the two German states, is in the development stage. It is extremely difficult to judge its final result today. In this situation, just as 35 years ago, to remain in the Warsaw Pact, I am deeply convinced, is in the state interests of Poland.

I would like to see a Europe free from any kind of barriers. Whether I will live to see it, only time will tell. Whatever you say, military blocs are a product of the "cold war" times.

The need to create a system of all-European security and abandon bloc thinking is long overdue. The Warsaw Pact's position here is principled and unequivocal: "No" to the division of Europe and the world into military blocs opposing one another, and "yes" to their simultaneous disbandment, the first step being to lend to the Warsaw Pact and NATO the character of politico-military organizations.

Troop Withdrawal From Poland Broadcast on TV

LD0406151290 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 1 Jun 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [Announcer] Here is another report from Warsaw, this time by our correspondent: [video shows Army jeeps loaded onto railway flatcars and young servicemen, wearing dress uniform, lined up for inspection; brief glimpse of civilian onlookers, including small children; shot of band playing; paratroopers in blue berets and striped vests are lined up, detachment by detachment; one paratrooper addresses the parade, while officers look on from a viewing stand; shot of officer, presumably Debicki, pinning medal on Soviet paratroop officer, then shaking hands with him]

[Correspondent Y. Ulyanov, identified by caption] The withdrawal of Soviet troops from Poland began today. It is taking place in accordance with the Soviet command's plan for the reduction of the Armed Forces, including those stationed abroad. Members of an airborne assault brigade are saying farewell to the town of Bialogard in the northwest of the country. Inhabitants of the town and representatives of the Polish Army command and the Soviet Army's Northern Group of Forces have come to see them off. Seventeen officers in the brigade have been awarded brotherhood-in-arms medals, which are presented to them by Lieutenant General Mieczyslaw Debicki. [video shows reporter in civilian dress, who interviews Polish Army officer]

He considers that the withdrawal of Soviet troops should, in accordance with the agreement with the Polish side, be carried out gradually, in step with the process of strengthening security in Europe. Farewell Poland! [video shows final shot of troop train pulling out]

IZVESTIYA Cites Walesa-Mazowiecki Conflict

PM2905133390 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 27 May 90 Morning Edition p 5

[Report by own correspondent L. Toporkov: "Walesa-Mazowiecki Conflict"]

[Excerpt] Warsaw—[passage omitted] A curious press conference was held in Warsaw at the end of last week. It was held by Senator Jaroslaw Kaczynski, chief editor of the weekly SOLIDARNOSC and chief of the "Agreement of centrist forces" which has just been created and which must probably be regarded as the embryo of a "Solidarity" political party. The task of the "Agreement" is to justify the need to accelerate reform processes in Poland and in particular L. Walesa's election as president without waiting for the already early parliamentary elections scheduled for next spring—his election, let us note, by the present parliament.

The evolution of the "Solidarity" leaders is notable in this respect. Whereas not so long ago they were fighting for the election of the president at nationwide elections and used any opportunity to reproach W. Jaruzelski for having been nominated to this post by the Sejm and not the entire people, now they themselves have concluded that there is no point in such a democratic procedure. J. Kaczynski has expressed himself in favor of a different model of power from the present one—a strong president who would be able to manage without the present parliamentary system.

I do not think, J. Kaczynski said, that anyone will seriously decide to oppose the "Solidarity" chairman. There are no contenders who would compete with Walesa, he said. Yet public opinion polls have shown that among possible presidential candidates Tadeusz Mazowiecki, now the country's most popular politician, is in the lead. Confrontation with Walesa, the senator warns, would be pointless in all respects.

Commenting on the press conference, GAZETA WYBORCZA writes: "The 'Center' proclaims democracy but is offering swifter nondemocratic elections. It is embarking on destabilization while asserting that it is seeking to avoid it. This political confusion could be a serious threat to nascent Polish democracy."

That there is a Walesa-Mazowiecki conflict is clear. Will it not affect the fate of the organs of local self-management which have only just emerged? What will be the relations between the "roof" and the "foundations?"

Poland is approaching the elections against a background of social tension: In a number of cities and rural regions protest actions are being mounted, sometimes in a very acute form—for instance, the strike by railroad workers in the north of the country, paralyzing train movement. Working people are demanding an improvement in the economic situation and social protection from the state which they are convinced is abandoning them to the fates. The number of unemployed in the country has already reached 400,000—every month another 100,000 are added to this figure. The trade unions (national council of trade unions) predict an even more disturbed summer and a hot fall. Attention is also drawn to cases of the persistent eradication from Poles' memories of the Soviet liberating mission in the war against Germany. The monuments in honor of the Soviet servicemen are being dismantled one after another. The latest such case occurred in Czestochowa City. It is intended to replace the statue of a Soviet soldier there with a statue of J. Pidulski, on the same pedestal.

Even here some people want to be guided by the policy of "acceleration." Some people, losing their historical farsightedness, are sowing the seeds of hostility and anti-Sovietism. But the "blank spots" of history cannot be eliminated merely by painting them black.

Polish Solidarity Finds Power 'a Burden'

PM0106101990 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
31 May 90 Second Edition p 5

[Article by Polish journalist Waldemar Mickiewicz under the "Poland Today" rubric: "Myths and Reality. Foreign Journalist's Controversial Comments"]

[Excerpt] Warsaw, May—[passage omitted] Poland has undergone a gigantic operation concerning prices—the cost of coal, electricity, and goods in popular demand has risen many times. Inflation has been checked, although one can observe a decline—and a large one, too—in output production—in some places by one-third. Our country is once again faced with an ordeal that can only be compared to that which was experienced following the proclamation of the 1944 July Manifesto on a postwar independent socialist state. Whenever they get the chance people are now saying that the former authorities naively expected to ensure an economic boom using ideological methods. But now, too, unfortunately, ideology prevails over realities. The only difference being that then we began to build a communist society straightaway without any training, whereas now we are building a pro-capitalist society.

The propensity for repeating past mistakes is surprising and sometimes inexplicable. This deliberate and, as it were, witting "encoding" of difficulties seems absurd at times. The view of the problem has been simplified in the extreme. Where does the way out lie? In putting new forces into the managerial echelon of power and replacing leaders—previously the people were just oppressed and now the new leaders have made them happy. There are already promises of paradise, although you only have to take a quick look round to see that the country has one foot in the grave. There then follows a second wave of appeals—for people to be selfless and deny themselves everything "for a few months," and then everything in the stores will be available to everyone and we will all begin to live a normal life. But this does beg the following question: If it took the other states, those selfsame "normal" states, to which we refer whenever we get the opportunity, 50 years to reach this "norm," will we transcend all our problems in a "few months" as a result of, excuse me, some magic? Or are the new leaders Solomons?

I am often prey to the agonizing question: Do the new leaders who rode the crest of the political wave during the last turbulent changes ponder the fact that the more thoroughly people's illusions about better times are dispelled, the more deeply the extremely dangerous public disappointment and apathy akin to "quiet" but powerful sabotage can be observed?

All the lessons of the past, sometimes easily forgotten, are the sorry legacy of our collective destiny. Politicians impudently disregarded the realism of objective reality and thought that you only have to create the appropriate public mood and "guarantee the proper propaganda," and success will come along on its own. Now today this slogan-oriented, strong-arm leadership is for some reason identified with the very essence of "communist rule" and its methodological foundations. But haven't cards from different decks gotten mixed up? After all, there are foundations, and they have been grossly distorted. Under Stalin there was dictatorship through lies and disregard for the people's interests, followed by the continuation of this dictatorship in a modified form. In-depth analysis and sober consideration of the past are what is needed, and only correct conclusions must be drawn—which is, incidentally, not easy. But it is particularly important today to ponder how to ensure in conditions of a new emerging state structure, as it were, that a different, huge, and dangerous lie does not grow out of the "old truths" by dint of distinctive historical features.

This is not a warning for the sake of cautiousness. It should be a matter of urgency for the Polish authorities to act honestly and openly. This is also dictated by the fact that economic depression within the country has brought it to the brink of economic paralysis. It may yet become an even greater catastrophe than that which we experienced at the very beginning of the 1980's. Fears like this arise when you hear once again about the "speedy revival" and creation of a "normal" country. These are just slogans as yet...

I personally have no doubt that Poland is currently eating its future. A two-fold drop in people's standard of living and a sharp decline in production were the high price paid for the relative calm at present. We are as taking a great step back, even in comparison with what we succeeded in achieving in the period 1956-1976. And this despite our apparent progress. It is, after all, no secret that producers came up against the barrier of demand as a result of the unbridled price hike. And yet demand is what people in those same "normal" states dream about. But lack of demand owing to ascetic restrictions on people's needs—as has happened in our country—is quite different. Production of all output can be "choked off" altogether, reduced by another 30 to 40 percent. Yet production has to be boosted, increased at some point. When and how? It is, moreover, a hundredfold harder to boost than to lower production. The problem of boosting production is almost the most important of the challenging world problems.

A premonition of the complications to come is already beginning to disturb even those people who seemed able to give only the seal of approval to what is happening. L. Walesa, for instance, was forced to make the following admission: "Poland cannot stand on one leg alone..." Simply amazing processes have begun within Solidarity itself: A current of left-wing forces has emerged—after so many years of "unity and struggle." To be more precise, after a 10-year struggle for power. They now have power. But it has proved to be a burden. In time, you have to be accountable for the results of wielding power. Only demarcation and opposition sentiments within the movement that has come to power can lessen the risk which radicals within it are banking on.

There is another nuance here. Accusations leveled at "Stalinism and communist crimes" will be exhausted in time. Beyond any doubt, a policy that guarantees success today by using anticommunist platforms will begin to lose its force. What then? Present-day politicians will have to do something specific to rehabilitate their own programs in the eyes of society. That is not easy to do, nor is it easy to give people something specific. And Poland's ruling forces have not as yet, in my view, made an attractive proposition.

Dictatorship may be the factor that diverts the masses from the evil of the day. I do not, regrettably, see any other "denouement" to the economic drama. But has Solidarity promised the Polish people dictatorship? It did not, of course, win last June's election as the result of promises of that kind. Solidarity promised people prosperity. But how can prosperity be created, where can it be obtained? Were the communists "to blame for everything"?

Laptev Receives Polish Parliamentarians

PM0506090190 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 3 Jun 90 Morning Edition p 5

[TASS report under general heading: "Official Reports"]

[Text] The complex processes of changes in Poland and the Soviet Union and the younger generation's participation in them were discussed 1 June in Moscow during a talk between I.D. Laptev, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet's Soviet of the Union, and a delegation from the Republic of Poland Sejm secretariat on questions of cooperation between young parliamentarians of the European countries, the United States, and Canada.

The changeover of generations now taking place in politics, I.D. Laptev said, often leads to the emergence of previously unknown problems like the need to form political culture and tolerance. But the young people who have joined our countries' parliaments rapidly assimilate the professional skills necessary to deputies.

West Europe

Official Views Upcoming Thatcher Visit

LD0406153990 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1325 GMT 3 Jun 90

[Text] Moscow, 4 June (TASS)—TASS diplomatic correspondents Ivan Ivanov and Yuriy Rublevskiy report from the press center of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs:

Mikolay Uspenskiy, head of the Second European Department of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs, called the visit to the USSR by British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher on 7 June an important step in the development of Soviet-British relations. He spoke today at a briefing at the press center of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs and reported on the program for the forthcoming visit.

Nikolay Uspenskiy reported that the main talks are to take place on 8 June. Meetings have been planned with USSR President Mikhail Gorbachev and with Nikolay Ryzhkov, chaiman of the USSR Council of Ministers, as well as with Dmitriy Yazov, USSR minister of defense, this latter at Margaret Thatcher's request. In the evening of that same day, the head of the British Government is expected to hold a press conference in Moscow. Then on 9 June the prime minister is to take part in ventures at the "Great Britain Days" in the USSR which opened today in Kiev, capital of Ukraine, one "of the most important undertakings in the history of Soviet-British relations," according to the Soviet expert. Margaret Thatcher will go on to visit Aremenia, where she will take part in a ceremony to open a school built by contributions from British people in earthquake-stricken Leninakan.

Nikolay Uspenskiy expressed the opinion that an important place on the agenda of Margaret Thatcher's talks with the Soviet leadership will be taken by a discussion of the results of the Soviet-U.S. summit, "which are unprecedented in concentration and impact on international events." In addition, a dialogue on European problems is anticipated, since processes are under way on this "which go far beyond the framework of the continent in scale: these encompass the division of Europe, the future of the all-European process, the unification of Germany, and its military, political and other consequences." A conversation is also expected on the situation at the disarmament forums; at the conventional weapons talks in Vienna; and the Geneva talks on a chemical weapons ban.

On Soviet-British relations in particular, Nikolay Uspenskiy expressed confidence that the meeting of the leaders of the two countries "will give them a new impetus and map out further guidelines for their development." During the visit, he continued, it is intended to sign a bilateral agreement on a long-term economic and industrial cooperation program for the period 1991-2000 and an agreement to set up cultural centers of Great Britain in the USSR and of the USSR in Great Britain. Documents will, evidently, also be drafted for signing for a cooperation program in the field of training management cadres, said the Soviet expert.

Answering a question from THE FINANCIAL TIMES, Nikolay Uspenskiy said that until Mikhail Gorbachev returns from the United States to Moscow, the question of whether the USSR president will go to Kiev with Margaret Thatcher to take part in the Great Britain Days in the USSR remains "open."

The correspondent for THE DAILY TELEGRAPH was interested in the question of the differences of opinion that exist in Soviet-British relations. Nikolay Uspenskiy said that these remain on two conceptual matters. The first is about the military and political status of a united Germany. Here Britain favors its membership of NATO, while "this option is not acceptable to the Soviet Union." In addition, he continued, "differences of opinion also remain on matters connected with the role of nuclear weapons now and in the world of the future." "I think there should be a very interesting discussion centering around these matters during the visit," said Nikolay Uspenskiy.

Shevardnadze Arrives in Copenhagen

LD0406180990 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 4 Jun 90

[Text] Shevardnadze, USSR minister of foreign affairs, arrived in Copenhagen today. He will take part in the work of the second meeting of the conference on the Human Dimension of the pan-European process which opens here on 5 June.

Meets With Minister

LD0406204690 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1750 GMT 4 Jun 90

[Text] Copenhagen, 4 June. (TASS)—E.A. Shevardnadze, USSR minister of foreign affairs, held a meeting here today with Denmark's Minister of Foreign Affairs Uffe Ellemann-Jensen.

At his counterpart's request, E.A. Shevardnadze spoke in detail of the impressive results of the talks between the Presidents of the USSR and United States in Washington, of which a notable feature was the productive nature of the dialogue in all areas of Soviet-U.S. relations.

When E.A. Shevardnadze and U. Ellemann-Jensen discussed European problems, both sides stressed the importance of intensifying the all-European process and establishing it as an institution and of creating such security structures as would correspond to everyone's interests. The confidence was expressed that the external aspects of building German unity could also be settled in the same spirit.

The ministers noted with satisfaction the positive dynamic of Soviet-Danish relations and agreed to hold an in-depth discussion of bilateral issues during the planned visit to Moscow by U. Ellemann-Jenson.

Reportage on Turkish Parliamentary Visit

Gorbachev Sends Greetings

PM0406135990 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 3 Jun 90 Morning Edition p 5

[Message from M. Gorbachev "To His Excellency Mr. Turgut Ozal, president of the Turkish Republic"]

[Text] On the 70th anniversary of the establishment of diplomatic relations between our countries, I send you, Mr. President, and the people of neighboring Turkey cordial congratulations and best wishes.

In our time of profound transformations the lofty meaning of the peace-loving principles laid at the foundation of Soviet-Turkish relations by V.I. Lenin and K. Ataturk can be seen particularly clearly.

Today we can note with satisfaction that, relying on the firm foundation of good relations, mutual interests, and trust, the Soviet Union and Turkey are confidently advancing along the path of good-neighborliness and mutually advantageous cooperation.

I express the hope for further progress in all spheres of friendly relations between our countries for the benefit of the Soviet and Turkish peoples and in the interests of world peace.

[Signed] M. Gorbachev.

Ryzhkov Sends Greetings

PM0506083590 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 3 Jun 90 Morning Edition p 5

[TASS report under general heading: "Exchange of Telegrams"]

[Text] On the 70th anniversary of the establishment of Soviet-Turkish diplomatic relations N.I. Ryzhkov, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, sent Turkish Prime Minister Y. Akbulat a telegram of congratulations noting that the course toward friendly, good-neighborly cooperation defined at the time of V.I. Lenin and K. Ataturk has received further positive development in our day on the basis of the principles of the new political thinking and that this development accords with the vital interests of the peoples of both countries and is making its contribution to the consolidation of universal peace.

The telegram from Turkish Prime Minister Y. Akbulat expresses confidence in the further development of friendly and good-neighborly relations between our countries and peoples on the basis of the principles of equality, independence, sovereignty, respect for territorial integrity, and noninterference in each other's internal affairs and in the interests of strengthening peace and stability in the region and in Europe.

There was also an exchange of telegrams between USSR and Turkish foreign ministers E.A. Shevardnadze and A. Bozer which assessed highly the advance of good-neighborly relations between our countries and the consolidation of trust and mutual understanding between them.

Relations Viewed

TA0306155890 Ankara ANATOLIA in English 1515 GMT 3 Jun 90

[Text] Moscow (A.A.)—Deputy Parliament Speaker Yildirim Avci, heading the parliamentary delegation invited to the USSR by the Soviet Union parliament, declared the Soviet Union and Turkey "were bound to live together" in friendship, peace and mutual understanding.

At a banquet given by the major of Leningrad in honour of the parliamentary delegation, Avci underlined Turkey's desire to enhance economic, political and cultural relations with the USSR and said that there was nothing that could prevent the furthering of relations. Avci added that this kind of development was to prove beneficial for both the parties.

A TV programme availed for the occasion, meanwhile, gave a more than three hour lasting strip on Istanbul last night to introduce the Bosphorus Bridge, the Sultan Ahmet Mosque, the bazaars and other famous areas of the city.

Laptev, Italian Parliamentarians Discuss Ties

LD0106164190 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0910 GMT 31 Jun 90

[Text] Moscow, 31 May (TASS)—The successful implementation of social and economic reforms in the Soviet Union will exert the most beneficial influence upon the development of Soviet-Italian links in various spheres. Ivan Laptev, chairman of the Soviet of the Union of the USSR Supreme Soviet, and the members of the delegation of the Labor Commission of the Chamber of Deputies of Italy led by its president, V. Mancini, were agreed on that in the course of a conversation that took place today.

The chairman of the chamber of the highest legislative body of the USSR told the guests about the solution of the current tasks of the renewal of the socialist society by the Soviet People. Stress was laid on the particular importance of establishing new approaches in the sphere of the economy: the transfer to market relations and the restoration to the man of labor of a true feeling of a master.

The leader of the Italian delegation spoke in favor of the transfer of contacts between the relevant commissions of the parliaments of the two countries to a permanent basis, and at the same time he stressed interest in deepening such cooperation. He expressed feelings of sincere liking and support for the policy of perestroyka.

Finnish Premier Visits Murmansk, Pollution Viewed

PM2905112190 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 25 May 90 Second Edition p 6

[TASS report under the general heading "Official Reports"]

[Text] Murmansk, 24 May—A Finnish Government delegation headed by Prime Minister H. Holkeri spent two days in Murmansk Oblast.

The aim of the Finnish premier's trip to the Soviet Polar region was to familiarize himself with the environmental protection situation at the "Pechenganikel" combine, which is notorious in northern Europe as one of the main sources of sulfur dioxide pollution of the atmosphere. H. Holkeri's meeting with leaders of the combine centered on what the enterprise administration is doing to clean up the environment and what part Finnish specialists could play in reducing the discharges of harmful gases. There was also an exchange of opinions with the oblast's leaders on opportunities for expanding economic cooperation between the northern regions of the USSR and Finland.

Analyst Critical of Norwegian Premier Remarks

LD0406162590 Moscow TASS in English 1600 GMT 4 Jun 90

[Text] Moscow June 4 TASS—By TASS political news analyst Yuriy Kornilov:

Norway's Prime Minister Jan Syse, about to leave for an official visit to Poland, received a Polish journalist. This is not unusual, and readers had a right to expect that the forthcoming visit, the state and prospects of Polish-Norwegian relations would be discussed. But it turned out that a representative of GAZETA WYBORCZA, the press organ of Solidarity, was interested in a different thing. He wanted to know what the Norwegian prime minister thinks about Norway's possibilities to bring pressure on the USSR to "speed up recognition of Lithuania's independence."

The strange question, to put it mildly, elicited a no less surprising answer. The prime minister said the following: "Naturally, we have certain influence on the Soviet Union, but what is most important is that we can bring pressure on other Western countries, that are larger than our country, so that their policy with regard to Lithuania become much more decisive."

Political leaders in various countries are aware that the Soviet Government, without denying the right of any republic to self-determination, justly demands that this process proceed in the constitutional framework, on the basis of law, not under the flag of anarchist and extremist actions. They are also aware of the fact that the so-called "Lithuanian problem" is the domestic affair of the Soviet Union and that special caution is needed in appraising this problem.

Such is the general attitude. But the Conservative Norwegian prime minister, going by his statement, has a different approach. His interview shows that he would not like Norway to interfere in the affairs of the neighbouring country, but is not averse to provoking others to such a step. He even thinks it is legitimate to edge them on to this, so that they should encourage separatists.

What purposes could be served by "more decisive" actions? In any case such actions would do nothing to settle "Lithuanian problem" and develop Soviet-Norwegian relations.

Foundation To Publish Marx-Engels Works

*PM0106141790 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
31 May 90 Second Edition p 5*

[TASS report: "The K. Marx and F. Engels Foundation"]

[Text] The Hague, 30 May—Talks were held at the International Institute of Social History in Amsterdam about continuing to publish the Complete Collected Works of Marx and Engels in their original languages (MEGA). Work on this unique international publication began in the USSR and GDR and was until now carried out mainly by the CPSU Central Committee Marxism-Leninism Institute and its counterpart in Berlin. So far, 76 books in 41 volumes have been published.

Taking part in the Amsterdam talks were representatives of the International Institute of Social History Foundation (Amsterdam), the CPSU Central Committee Marxism-Leninism Institute (Moscow), the GDR Academy of Sciences (Berlin), and the F. Ebert Karl Marx House Foundation (Trier, FRG).

Agreement was reached that, in view of the scientific, historical, and topical significance of the ideas of K. Marx and F. Engels, the complete publication of the whole of their literary legacy remains one of the most important international scientific programs.

Agreement was reached that the International Institute of Social History Foundation, which possesses a large part of K. Marx' and F. Engels' manuscript legacy; the CPSU Central Committee Marxism-Leninism Institute, which possesses a considerable part of this legacy; the GDR Academy of Sciences; and the Karl Marx House will undertake joint actions to continue the publication of the Complete Collected Works of Marx and Engels on a wider international basis.

To this end, and in accordance with the provisions of The Netherlands law, the four aforementioned scientific institutions will set up the "International Marx and Engels Foundation" with residence in Amsterdam, which will act as the publisher of the Complete Collected Works of Marx and Engels.

Supreme Soviet Session

Boyko Speaks on Market Economy 29 May

LD0406150690 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1913 GMT 29 May 90

[Speech by People's Deputy A. Boyko, deputy chairman of the Committee for Economic Reform at the 29 May USSR Supreme Soviet session in the Kremlin—recorded]

[Excerpts] Esteemed comrade deputies, the draft decision [on a regulated market economy] is not as simple as it might look, so I think it necessary to comment on things that are in need of comment. First, I would like to quote Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev: In his interview with TIME, he spoke of replacing the economic and political models with new ones—within the framework of socialist, of course. It's from this angle that we today must very soberly evaluate the situation in which we find ourselves and make decisions commensurate with it. I think we cannot fail to agree with what Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov has said here. His arguments are quite convincing as regards the need for an inevitable transition to a regulated market economy. The old system patently has no future; we must realize this clearly and convince the people of it. [passage omitted]

To start with I would like to stress that the issue of raising bread and bread product prices was, as you will remember, initially combined with the draft on the situation in the country and the concept of transition to a resulated market economy. The commission has now deemed it necessary for this issue [pauses]...though it naturally has a bearing on the reform since, in fact, everything in the economy now has a nearing, but there is no direct and immediate link, and the issue can be singled out as an independent and separate draft decision, which is what we have done, and naturally it will be examined outside the context of transition to a regulated market economy.

So let's look at the basic draft on the economic situation in the country and the concept of transition to a regulated market economy in the USSR. I'm not going to read the first point here—you can see that what it boils down to is, with due consideration for suggestions made by a number of deputies, taking this document into account. Next it says that the USSR Council of Ministers should be instructed to continue working on the package of documents, taking into account, of course, the proposals that have come and are coming in. The commission feels this would be the wisest compromise solution, as I would describe it, because we cannot endorse the entire concept as a whole—there are some serious observations to be made—but we do accept it as a strategic guideline for transformation. This is why we are instructing or should instruct the government to continue working on the document. To be specific, we have a large package in mind—on pages three and four you can see a list of legislative enactments that will in fact represent a concrete unfolding of this concept and its further practical implementation. [passage omitted]

Point four: As you can see, it talks not about a referendum, but about a nationwide discussion instead. The commission, and I personally, believe this option to be more acceptable, since one cannot decide issues by a direct vote, though one must undoubtedly know the people's view. Then, as regards the specific methods by which this study is to be carried out, you can see the continuation on page three: A number of committees and commissions are instructed to discuss these methods before 10 June, and to submit proposals, thereby accomplishing this work. [passage omitted]

Finally, point seven: I think, on a constructive level, that this is the most important element of the draft decision, and I will read it so that all the citizens listening and watching us can hear it: To recommend the USSR president to issue decrees or to instruct the USSR Council of Ministers to adopt and put into effect from 1 July 1990 normative acts for implementing the laws on property, land, leasehold relations in the USSR, and first and foremost on the development of small enterprises, on freedom of economic activity and enterprise, on the denationalization and decentralization of property, and a provisional statute on joint-stock societies and other associations.

Why is all this necessary? It has already been stated here that the law on value [as heard] is not being implemented. Well, it has to be said that nor could it have been implemented, since it comes into force from 1 July. So taking into account the law on land and the others that are already in force, we really must think out a mechanism for putting these laws into effect. In this connection I think we must also give the government the right to introduce appropriate decisions and acts to facilitate implementation. We also have to analyze issues of denationalization and, naturally, issues of the establishment of communal property—we're talking about decentralization here. In other words we must not put off to the distant future the solution of this problem of demarcating property between, let's say, the center, the republics, and the local soviets, because the local soviets are now very much in need of communal property in order to develop their initiative. As far as small enterprises, enterprises, and so on are concerned, they must develop in the widest variety [pauses]...in all forms of property. I think this is the way not only to implement the law on property, which is precisely what sets up the structure without which any transition to the market would be impossible.

That's all I have to say on the main draft. Now for the second draft—the draft USSR Supreme Soviet decision on the procedure for introducing new retail prices for bread and bread products. The commission realizes just how unpopular this decision is, but we're too busy staying alive to worry about luxuries, as it were. By an overwhelming majority the commission has supported this, and considers it essential—as you will see in point one—to support the proposal by the USSR Government to introduce new retail prices for bread and bread products beginning 1 July 1990.

This begin the case, there are few arguments, so to speak, that I would like to put foward here, because we really have struck fear into the people with these price rises. Our people are very well aware that prices have gone up, but they have never known what compensation means, it's something quite unfamiliar to them. So this is something we have to talk about, spelling out all the arguments.

First, as regards the price rises, these are really quite unavoidable. You could, of course, hold down prices for as long as you like—on paper, of couurse—but the hole in our budget would increase, money printing would continue, purchasing power would naturally fall, and that would cause across-the-board price rises not only on bread, but on everything else as well. So we have to take a sober view of this and understand the economists correctly in this matter. We cannot, I repeat, make prices fall by raising our hands to vote: We could hold them down, but I repeat that this would be paradise for black marketeers, literally a paradise. As to specifically why this is necessary—first of all, to bring retail and wholesale prices into systemic conformity.

Second, you can see that the words "in good time" have been added to the new draft decision—that is, compensation for the prices rises is to be full and in good time, 10 days or perhaps two weeks in advance. You know Czechoslovakia's experience—well, we believe it should be used here, so that people recieve the compensation somewhat earlier than their expenditure begins. [passage omitted]

Naturally there may be other options, and the commission does not rule these out. Perhaps we should cut prices on wines and spirits etc., but that's a separate question. This is not, of course, the end of the discussion. We invite you to submit your proposals in written form on this issue and all others, and naturally the commission will continue its work, collating these options and putting them forward again for discussion. Thank you.

Moscow TV Reports Supreme Soviet Session 4 Jun

LD0406220590

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 2040 GMT on 4 June begins carrying a recorded relay of the USSR Supreme Soviet joint session from the Kremlin in Moscow. Reception is good.

Lukyanov is shown speaking to deputies. He passes on greetings from Gorbachev. Lukyanov says 389 deputies are present.

At 2041 GMT those present stand in memory of the Bashkiria rail disaster.

At 2042 GMT announcer says that discussion on the Law on Enterprises continues. Lukyanov says all comrades have copies of the draft. He asks Bushuyev to report.

At 2043 GMT Deputy Bushuyev reports on amendments to the wording of sections of the draft law.

At 2052 GMT Deputy Sazonov asks for clarification on the status of an enterprise as a legal entity. Bushuyev replies.

At 2054 GMT Deputy Kopysov queries a point about the definition of an enterprise's management. Bushuyev feels the wording should stay as it is.

At 2056 GMT Deputy Lubenchenko suggests that enterprises should be able to choose their legal status.

At 2058 GMT an unidentified deputy asks about the liability of managers who have ruined an enterprise. Bushuyev says manager's contracts will stipulate this.

At 2100 GMT Deputy Kharkov suggests an amendment concerning autonomous republics and another minor rewording. Bushuyev accepts the first suggestion as useful.

At 2104 GMT an unidentified deputy is shown reading from a draft, which he says would allow existing ties between enterprises to be disrupted. He suggests that the effect of part of the law should be suspended for several years.

At 2106 GMT Deputy Kozyrev suggests a different wording for one article.

At 2108 GMT Deputy Sazonov feels that the law goes together with the new forms of ownership, and its effect should not be delayed.

At 2109 GMT an unidentified deputy speaks on behalf of the committee, saying some provisions can be suspended for two years for state enterprises only.

At 2110 GMT Deputy Miloserdnov puts forward a point about the deleterious effects of suddenly breaking ties. Several deputies debate it. Lukyanov sums up their points, offers the suggestion that a provisional resolution should suspend the effect of the Law on State Enterprises only until January 1993, and calls for a vote: 298 for, 51 against, 17 abstentions. The amendment to the resolution is passed.

At 2117 GMT Lukyanov calls for comments on financial-credit relations. Deputy Babchenko offers some rewording which he thinks will protect the less well-off. (Tatarchuk) says the wording is supposed to close loopholes about sources of income. Miloserdnov says he supports the committee's version. It is less liable to manipulations. Kucherenko talks about the wording on enterprises' bank accounts. Gritsenko makes a point about wage payments, which should be made when goods have been produced. Orlov says goods are not goods until they are marketed. Kucherenko withdraws his amendment, as he has found it covered elsewhere. (Tatarchuk) speaks for the committee in favor of payment on calendar dates. Abalkin says the government supports the committee's views.

At 2131 GMT an unidentified deputy proposes an amendment which he feels would encourage inventors and rationalizers. (Tatarchuk) replies.

At 2132 GMT the announcer says the Supreme Soviet managed to pass the Law on Enterprises toward the end of the evening session. The vote board shows 350 for, 4 against, and 4 abstentions.

At 2133 GMT Lukyanov calls on Deputy Kisin to speak. He reads a message from a group of deputies calling for an analysis of the work of the Supreme Soviet in light of interrepublican relations to enhance the prestige of the Supreme Soviet. Lukyanov promises to show the message to the Presidium and discuss it. At 2136 GMT the recorded relay ends. At 2137 GMT the announcer says the session continues tomorrow. It will discuss tax laws and the work of cooperatives.

Session Adopts Law on Enterprises

LD0406152890 Moscow TASS in English 1521 GMT 4 Jun 90

[By TASS parliamentary correspondents Andrey Orlov and Vladimir Isachenkov]

[Text] Moscow, 4 June, TASS—The Soviet parliament today adopted a law on enterprises in the USSR. The law provides equal conditions for economic activities of enterprises of various types—state-run, lease-holding, collective, cooperative, and individual.

The law will enter into force from January 1 next year.

Details of New Enterprise Law Viewed

LD0406162190 Moscow TASS in English 1558 GMT 4 Jun 90

[Text] Moscow June 4 TASS—By TASS parliamentary correspondents Andrey Orlov and Vladimir Isachenkov:

The Soviet parliament today adopted a law on enterprises in the USSR. The law provides equal conditions for economic activities by enterprises of various types—state-run, lease-holding, collective, cooperative, and individual.

The law will enter into force on January 1, 1991.

Speakers pointed out that this legal act aims to broaden substantially the independence of enterprises, which is utterly essential during the transition to market relations.

This legal act introduces a generalising indicator of the results of economic activity by all types of enterprises—profit—and envisages a single channel for allocations to the state budget.

Profit-based settlements with ministries and departments are ruled out. A single system has been established for the founding of an enterprise, registration, the endorsement of a statute, reorganisation and liquidation.

In accordance with this law, enterprises have the right to sell their produce at prices established independently or on a contract basis. The practice of drawing funds by issuing shares and bonds is gaining in scope. Emphasis is being laid on market relations in matters of material and technical support.

The law extends the rights of work collectives to establish new plants and to overcome monopolism. Work collectives have been granted equal rights with representatives of the owner in managing the property of the enterprise.

The Soviet parliament on Tuesday will consider a bill on the taxation of enterprises, which has already been discussed several times, and amendments to the law on cooperatives.

Supreme Soviet Presidium Discusses Issues

LD0406192290 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1811 GMT 4 Jun 90

[Text] Moscow, 4 June. (TASS)—It is reported here officially that on 4 June there was a sitting in the Kremlin of the presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet under the chairmanship of A.I. Lukyanov.

The question was examined of the concluding stage of the third session of the USSR Supreme Soviet and an approximate schedule of its work was approved.

Problems connected with the elaboration of the draft plan of the preparation and examination of drafts of legislative acts in the USSR Supreme Soviet in the second half of 1990 and in 1991-1992 were discussed. Proposals were examined on some changes in the composition of the committees of the USSR Supreme Soviet and of the standing commissions of the chambers. Materials on these questions are being presented for the examination of the Supreme Soviet and its chambers.

The presidium heard information gvien by N.D. Pivovarov, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet committee on the work of soviets of people's deputies and the development of government and self-government, on the draft law on the procedure for recalling a USSR people's deputy, which has been prepared for publication. In accordance with a resolution of the Second Congress of USSR People's Deputies, it was decided to publish the draft law, on which further work has been done to take into account the comments and proposals of the deputies, in the press for discussion. The Supreme Soviet committee on the work of the soviets of people's deputies and the development of government and self-government, with other committees and commissions taking part, has been charged with drawing together the comments and proposals on the said draft law and with submitting it for the consideration of the USSR Supreme Soviet.

Several other matters linked to the work of the USSR Supreme Soviet were also discussed.

Agenda for Supreme Soviet Session Outlined

LD0506101290 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0630 GMT 5 Jun 90

[Text] A joint sitting of the chambers of the USSR Supreme Soviet is taking place today. At the start of the sitting, Anatoliy Ivanovich Lukyanov reported that yesterday there was a meeting of the Supreme Soviet Presidium—quite a long meeting—at which issues relating to the work of the session were examined and a provisional timetable was drawn up for its work—quite a packed timetable, it should be said. The work of the session is expected to last until 14 June.

So, what draft laws are included? In particular, it is proposed that the draft law on the press and the other mass media will be examined tomorrow. That will be the second reading of the bill.

It is proposed that on Thursday, at separate sittings of the Council of Nationalities and the Council of the Union, there will be a first reading of the bill on the Soviet militia and a bill on amendments and addenda to the principles of criminal proceedings in the USSR and in the union republics.

There is to be a joint sitting of the Council of the Union and the Council of Nationalities on Tuesday, 12 June. At it, USSR President Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev will speak on the outcome of his meeting with the U.S. President and on the results of the meeting of the Political Consultative Committee of the Warsaw Pact member states.

It is expected that on the same day a decision will be adopted on the government's report on the country's economic situation and on the concept of the switch to a regulated market economy.

The deputies will devote quite a lot of time this session to the bill on taxes on enterprises, associations, and organizations. In particular, the plan is that this law should be adopted. The last two days of the session—13 and 14 June—are given over to this law in the hope that it will be adopted. Discussion of this bill in its first reading is continuing today. Even though the deputies at this session have returned to this bill three or four times now, I should remind you that no decision has yet been made to pass it on its first reading.

A number of deputies have raised the question of including the bill on immigration and emigration on the agenda. Deputy Likhanov has also suggested including the Supreme Soviet's ratification of the international convention on the rights of the child. It appears that this document will be examined at this session.

At Arbitration Commission, which was especially set up to deal with the bill on the taxation of enteprises, has, along with the government, carefully studied all the suggestions and comments. It has had three meetings and Deputy Anatoliy Nikolayevich Saunin has been presenting the final version. He works within the Council of the Union's Commission on Planning, Budget, and Finance. He is still on the rostrum. The report is continuing.

And on that I end my report from the Kremlin.

Supreme Soviet Session Extended for Further Week

LD0506085690 Moscow TASS in English 0824 GMT 5 Jun 90

[By TASS parliamentary correspondents Vladimir Isachenkov and Andrey Orlov]

[Text] Moscow June 5 TASS—Soviet lawmakers battling with a legislative pile-up decided to extend their session for yet another week - until June 14.

Soviet lawmakers must still pass their verdict on the government programme for the transition to a regulated market economy, hear President Gorbachev's report on his stay in Canada and the United States and discuss bills on the press and the militia and amendments to the criminal code and to the law on cooperatives.

Early today, the two chambers of the parliament returned for the third time to discussing the bill on taxation of enterprises.

Political & Social

'All-Union' Political Strike Preparations Begin

LD0406162590 Vilnius Domestic Service in Russian 1200 GMT 4 Jun 90

[Text] According to reports from Moscow, preparations are under way in the USSR for an all-Union political strike. It is proposed that strike committees will be (?set up) [words indistinct], while the strike itself will start at the end of June or beginning of July. The start will coincide with the opening of the 28th CPSU Congress. The following demands are being discussed: that the USSR Congress of People's Deputies be dissolved and direct elections for the USSR president be held, or, at a minimum, that all deputies nominated by public organizations be recalled; that Ryzhkov's government resign; and that a coalition government be formed with the confidence of the people from representatives of all political parties and [words indistinct].

Youth Sit-In Staged on Tiananmen Anniversary

AU0506084090 Paris AFP in English 2359 GMT 4 Jun 90

[Text] Moscow, June 5 (AFP)—About 30 Soviet youths, holding lighted candles and wearing headbands with pro-democracy slogans in Chinese, staged a brief sit-in in Moscow's Red Square Monday to mark the anniversary of the Tiananmen Square massacre.

The sit-in disbanded after police closed off Red Square and asked the youths to leave.

Among the demonstrators were militants who had taken part in May Day counterdemonstrations in Moscow this year.

About 15 young Poles held a sit-in in front of the Chinese Embassy in Warsaw, chanting "Freedom for China" and "Down with (Chinese Premier) Li Peng."

There was a brief scuffle with police as the protestors were pushed back from the immediate area surrounding the embassy, which was unlit and appeared deserted.

A similar protest was held before the Chinese consulate in the Baltic Sea port of Gdansk. In the western city of Poznan, students went on a 24-hour fast to demand the release of Chinese students still imprisoned after the June 4, 1989 crackdown.

In Bucharest, about 60 Romanian students gathered for one hour before the Chinese embassy, bearing banners with slogans such as "Down with the gerontocracy," "We remember Tiananmen," and "We are with the Chinese students."

They were wearing white headbands and carrying candles.

The protest ended without incident.

Vnukovo Airport 'Paralyzed' by Plane Shortage

LD0406221590 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1930 GMT 4 Jun 90

[no video available]

[Text] Today, the work of one of Moscow's airports was practically paralyzed.

[Begin recording] [Female reporter] There is no alternative. We are not offered anything yet apart from flying on a plane, on Aeroflot. At least from Vnukovo. Indeed, now, that is just the same as not flying at all. There just is not anything to fly on. Due to the shortage of planes, if one is to believe the brief airport terminal indicator board, 50 flights from this secondary airport have been cancelled or, at best, rescheduled for tomorrow.

Over the past four days, the not very respectable Vnukovo, which with difficulty usually daily accommodates 1,500 people meeting and accompanying passengers, as well as those flying off, has swelled by 3,600 people who have not flown away anywhere. How they feel and what the first of them think about all that, you can imagine. The administrators, flying control officers, and the terminal chief probably know that.

However, as before, the Ilyushin and Tupolevs are standing immobile and aloof on the airstrip. While the indicator board is just as implacable.

Well, just try to guess what is happening. Are the Moscow rains to blame for everything? Or perhaps a strike? I received an unequivocal reply to the latter notion—no. However, the chief of the airport terminal could not help getting emotional.

[Airport terminal chief] On the whole, of course, it would be worth going on strike. And to show thereby one's dissatisfaction to those powers, those leaders, who have not provided us with equipment. We physically do not have the planes. We have planes, but they are standing without engines, without spare parts. That's to say, in principle, well, 50 percent of the fleet is working, 50 percent of the fleet is standing shoeless and undressed. That is, they are not equipped, cannot make flights. The Ministry of Aviation Industry has not supplied us with these spare parts and, well, such a situation is the result.

[Female reporter] And things go from bad to worse. According to Nikolay Pavlovich [not further identified], tomorrow, there will be more such flights cancelled, or at best, postponed for a day.

Such situations are becoming imminent in Domodedovo and in Sheremetyevo, too. But it seems that the Ministry of the Aviation Industry does not fear even international scandals. And as for the poor passengers, the time they have lost, their spent nerves, and finally, the money they have laid out from their own pockets, here, everything is as always. And there is no compensation whatsoever. [end recording]

Yeltsin Among Delegates Elected to Congress

PM0406134590 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 2 Jun 90 Second Edition p 2

[TASS report: "Elected to the Congress"]

[Text] A.S. Sokolov, secretary of Moscow CPSU Obkom [Oblast Committee], A.G. Gladyshev, party committee secretary at the "Zarechye" Sovkhoz [state farm] in Odintsovo, and A.S. Travin, general director of the "Volokolamskiy" Agro-Industrial Combine, have been elected delegates to the 28th CPSU Congress from the Moscow region party organization.

The miners of the Kuzbass will be represented at the party congress by V.I. Lepeshkin, mining machine operator at the "Novokuznetskaya" Pit, V.M. Lyakh, a drift miner from Prokopyevsk, USSR People's Deputy T.G. Avaliani, first secretary of the CPSU Gorkom [City Committee], and A.G. Melnikov, first secretary of Kemerovo CPSU Obkom.

Meetings of Communists in the Tambov area have already elected 16 delegates. These include L.N. Svechin, engineer and instructor at the Southeastern Railroad's "Michurinsk" Locomotive Depot, Ye.M. Podolskiy, first secretary of Tambov CPSU Obkom, and V.N. Safonov, chief of the Tambov Oblast KGB Administration.

Buryatia's Communists have elected as delegates V.B. Saganov, chairman of the autonomous republic's Council of Ministers, L.V. Potapov, first secretary of Buryat CPSU Obkom, V.V. Belousov, welder at the V.M. Kushnarev Shipyard, and L.D. Tsybikzhapov, chairman of the board at the "Kommunizm" Kolkhoz [collective farm].

Kamchatka's Communists have elected M.I. Malashenko, captain at the "Rybkholodflot" base, N.N. Lapchenko, chief of the emergency rescue department at the Kamchatka Steamship Company, P.P. Zinovyev, chairman of the oblast soviet, V.A. Voloshin, commander of the North Kamchatka Air Detachment, and others.

Those who will represent the Sverdlovsk party organization include Ye.V. Muroshkin, chief of surgery at the Slobodo-Turinskiy Rayon Hospital, B.N. Yeltsin, chairman of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet, and M.A. Smirnov, electric fitter at the Kachkanar Mining and Enrichment Combine.

Ligachev Interviewed at Komsomol Congress

WA0106194090 Baku BAKINSKIY RABOCHIY in Russian 16 May 90 p 1

[Report on interview with Ye.K. Ligachev by AZERBAYDZHAN GYANDZHLYARI correspondent Azer Gudratogly: "Ye.K. Ligachev: 'Be Confident, Azerbaijan!'"]

[Text] **Among the 553 Soviet and foreign journalists covering the 21st VLKSM [All-Union Leninist Communist Youth League] Congress was Azer Gudratogly, special correspondent of the newspaper. During a break he approached Ye.K. Ligachev, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and secretary of Central Committee, and asked him to answer a few questions.**

AZERINFORM offers, in abridged form, the text of this interview, which was published on 12 May 1990 in the newspaper AZERBAYDZHAN GYANDZHLYARI.

[Gudratogly] Yegor Kuzmich, what do you like about the congress?

[Ligachev] As of the 11th, I have participated in many Komsomol [Communist Youth League] congresses. But I have not before seen one so candid and high-minded. I like this very much. It is a good thing that the youth are not embarrassed about expressing their thoughts plainly. About everything—good and bad—what is more. And it is necessary to continue in this spirit. We will, most likely, make use of the experience of the 21st Komsomol Congress in the preparations for the 28th party congress.

[Gudratogly] And what do you not like?

[Ligachev] Approximately half of the time is being devoted to procedural matters. Much attention is being paid to the "suggestion" of personal positions. The general course of the congress is frequently disrupted. But time should be treasured and valued.

[Gudratogly] Yegor Kuzmich, a question giving rise to much discussion and argument—the CPSU Central Committee Open Letter to the Communists—is currently at the center of attention of the country, of the Komsomol Congress included. Some people are seeing it as an invitation to debate. But others are finding in it a return to punitive measures. What is your opinion?

[Ligachev] The letter to the Communists is not the result of some people's whim but an urgent necessity. It was born not at the demand of individuals but dictated by the times, the present day.

The country is economically and politically in a very difficult position, and it is necessary to emerge from the crisis. And realities today are such that we see no force other than the CPSU which is capable of tackling these questions. And for this reason this force must be united and must not be split. You know, the time has come when one and the same question is being discussed in the Presidential Council, in the Supreme Soviet and in the Politburo, and the appropriate decisions are being made. In my view, the main decision should be adopted by the Communists. And for this reason the CPSU Central Committee is appealing with the letter to the Communists and ascertaining their position. What's wrong with this?

Many people believe that with its letter the CPSU Central Committee is keeping down the supporters of the "Democratic Platform." But this is not the case. Otherwise we would not have published the "Democratic Platform" in PRAVDA. Simply put, on the eve of the 28th party congress we are appealing to all Communists and all forces of the party for unity.

Of course, there are other political forces which have also formulated paths for the country's emergence from the crisis. The CPSU is ready to enter into dialogue with them, but only within the framework of the constitution and the program and rules. Such is our position. But there are also those who are specially counterposing themselves to the party, are bent on an artificial division and are creating factions. The question arises here: Whose is the satisfactory position?—which we, with the help of the letter, have on the eve of the 28th congress put to all the country's Communists and await an answer. In a word, our letter is not from the sphere of punitive measures but discussion.

[Gudratogly] What is your personal attitude toward a multiparty system and intra-party factions?

[Ligachev] Life has been particularly fleeting of late, and people are changing also.... A few years ago I personally was an opponent of a multiparty system, but now I am for it. For intra-party factions included. On just one condition: that a faction be formed not just for the sake of forming it, not artificially. That it not aspired by unrealistic promises to win for itself artificial authority among the people. In a word, I am a supporter of a disciplined, organized, logical, and purposeful faction. And one further point. An intra-party faction should not be seen as opposition to the leadership and the party's rank and file. If matters concern the Communist Party, it should organize its activity within the framework of the Communist Party. There can be no going beyond the framework of the program and rules and ideology of this party. Otherwise one is no longer a member of the Communist but of some other party. I am not being ironical in saying this to everyone. If you do not like the program, rules, and ideology of the Communist Party, please, form a new party and be a member of it. Who could prevent this? But formally remaining in the ranks of one party, but in deeds serving another—this serves no good purpose. In a word, the formation of factions within the Communist Party is possible within the framework of the CPSU Program and Rules. But a multiparty system and intra-party factions are different things. Do you agree?

[Gudratogly] I do.

[Ligachev] I have, consequently, one more fellow thinker.

[Gudratogly] In this case, share with your fellow thinker your thoughts about Baku, about Azerbaijan.

[Ligachev] I have twice visited Baku and Azerbaijan—it is paradise! Beautiful nature, a bountiful region. And the people—even better! Say a big hello to them from me!

[Gudratogly] With great pleasure! But... Yegor Kuzmich, I confess that I intend to ask you my main question. I would like to know your attitude and position in respect of the tragic January events in Baku.

[Ligachev] ...I am a member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and a secretary of the Central Committee, and for this reason the Central Committee position is my position.

[Gudratogly] Excuse my insistence, Yegor Kuzmich, I would like to know your position not as a secretary of the Central Committee and member of the Politburo but as an ordinary Communist, as an ordinary man.

[Ligachev] ...Let us not irritate the wounds. Of course, there were mistakes, and I expressed my personal position in this connection to your leadership.

In any event, it is necessary to summon up strength, display composure and look confidently and openly to the future. Your people are worthy of this!

[Gudratogly] Your wishes for our people?

[Ligachev] Once again composure and belief in yourselves!

Preparations for Peasant Union Founding Congress

LD3005085290 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 30 May 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] There was a sitting today of the organizational committee for preparations for the constituent congress of the country's Peasant Union.

It adopted the decision to hold the constituent congress in Moscow on 11-13 June this year. A total of 2,168 delegates, representatives of agricultural workers in the country, will take part in the work of the congress.

It is also proposed that many people's deputies of the USSR, members of the committee on agrarian issues and food of the USSR Supreme Soviet, and leaders of ministries and departments connected with the activity of the agroindustrial complex, will also take part in the work of the congress.

Various Party Committees Elect First Secretaries

PM0406135590 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 2 Jun 90 Second Edition p 2

[TASS reports under the general heading: "Conferences Held"]

[Text] Blagoveshchensk, 1 Jun—The first secretary of Amur CPSU Obkom [Oblast Committee] was elected today on a contested basis at the oblast party conference.

A secret ballot resulted in most of the conference participants supporting V.N. Shilov, who had previously been the obkom second secretary.

Smolensk, 1 Jun—The results of the discussion of the CPSU Central Committee draft platform for the 28th party congress and the CPSU Statutes were examined today at the 25th Smolensk Oblast party conference.

The conference examined an organizational question. V.A. Samorodskiy, who had previously been a secretary of the party obkom, was elected first secretary of the CPSU Obkom from among three candidates on a contested basis.

Krasnodar, 1 Jun—Participants in the kray party conference held today advocated the creation of an RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Communist Party on the CPSU Platform with an independent Central Committee and Control and Auditing Commission.

Its delegates discussed the report from I.K. Polozkov, first secretary of the party kraykom [kray committee].

Economic

Commodities Exchange To Be Set Up For Economy

PM0406151790 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 4 Jun 90 Morning Edition p 2

[I. Demchenko article: "Moscow Exchange: The Big Time"]

[Text] A presentation was held 2 June to mark the signing of the inauguration documents for the Moscow Commodities Exchange. Its founders are the Moscow Gorispolkom [city soviet executive committee] Main Administration for Material and Technical Supply, the USSR Association of Young Enterprise Leaders, the "Voltek" Soviet-Yugoslav-Italian joint venture, the USSR Union of Young People's Scientific and Technical Creativity, Small Venture, and Innovation Firm Centers, and the USSR Union of Construction and Industrial Cooperatives.

A commodities exchange is one of the most important elements in a market economy and is a special form of retail trade under market conditions. The historically prevailing mechanism behind its function is as strict as the components of a classical drama: regular trades, a strictly limited timeframe for their execution, and a single location for trading operations—the floor of the exchange. In itself the ritual nature of the regulations shows that the exchange is a game, but a big-time game with very major consequences. The stakes in the game will be commodity lots—in our case these will initially be output not produced under state orders and intended for free sale, and above-normative stocks and commercial by-products held by enterprises. In total, it will mean a streamlining of barter trade between enterprises and regions (commodity for commodity), the determination of the regional supply-demand relationship for articles for material and technical purposes, and the establishment of economic ties between exchange members and visitors to it.

It is hard to overestimate the exchange's role in a modern, developed society. It is really a barometer of political as well as economic processes. Any government project—all the more so a draft law—is assessed at the exchange from the standpoint of its impact on the existing situation. Correspondingly the processes taking place in the exchange concern each individual one way or another. The registration and further publication of price levels fixed during trades are of the greatest importance for the entire national economy. The way in which commodities or securities are quoted determines in practice their market value throughout the country's territory. That is why commodities quotations are a most important result of the exchange's work.

The exchange's activities will undoubtedly destroy the state monopoly on the centralized distribution of funds and quotas far more forcefully and rapidly than any legislation on this score. It was for this reason, incidentally, that we closed our last exchange in the late twenties. But in 1924 there had been around 100 of them—an entire network covering the whole country.

The founders of the Moscow Commodities Exchange are undoubtedly in a very difficult position today. The habits and skills of conducting trades and corresponding operations have been lost; there are no professional brokers; the largest banks continue to be subordinate to the state; enterprise is only beginning to be reborn, and in the sphere of the state economy centralized distribution of resources continues to prevail. Nonetheless, they are fully resolved, with the Moscow city soviet's support, to launch this complex mechanism. The Moscow gorispolkom, which made the special decision to set up the exchange, is instructing enterprises, associations, and institutions to actively participate in its work. And I think that nonstate enterprises will get involved themselves. The founders are hoping to open the exchange around the end of this year or the start of next year.

Voronezh Citizens Cited on Economic Transition

PM0106080790 Moscow Television Service in Russian 0830 GMT 30 May 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [Newscaster] There are as many opinions as there are people. This saw is also true with regard to the reactions to the concept proposed by the government to the USSR Supreme Soviet for the transition to a regulated market economy. Here is a report from Voronezh.

[Reporter L. Maksimov, identified by caption] The people of Voronezh had almost lost interest in the television relays from the Kremlin. But no one remained indifferent after Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov's report and our President M.S. Gorbachev's speech.

[Unidentified young man] I agree with the president's speech. These are all necessary matters and topical questions, dealing with the latest news, so to speak. It is of course clear to everyone that things won't go any quicker, but it is necessary to switch to a market economy.

[Militiaman S.A. Pelipenko, identified by caption] The situation in the country is extremely catastrophic. But, in my view, it is necessary to saturate [the market] with daily essentials in order to set the economy to rights; the ministers responsible for these areas of work must be called strictly to account. But my impression is that there is no exactingness here at local level. The local authorities must be called to account—strictly called to account. That is the only way that the situation in the country can be rectified.

[Unidentified young woman] Well, what can I say? It seems that I will now be more destitute, poorer still.

[Interjection from woman off camera] Quite poor.

[Young woman] Yes. I live on R35, but apart from what my husband earns it's a matter of kopeks. There may be no pasta and pastries in the stores now, but when they rise in price, I just won't be able to afford them any more. What else can I say? As far as a market economy is concerned, what can I say, it seems a bit premature to me. But I don't understand this at all—politics.

Impact of Price Hikes on Family Budgets Examined

904D0128A Moscow TRUD in Russian 31 May 90 p 2

[Article by TRUD political commentator V. Golovachev: "The Council of Ministers' Arithmetics"]

[Text] **The people have to know exactly what awaits them during the transfer to the regulated market economy.**

There is no "hotter" subject today than the price reform suggested by the government. This reform should serve as one of the central points in the transition to the regulated market economy. In spite of a lot of talk it is not very easy to understand a concrete situation and to "measure" the price increase against your own family budget if you do not do some "down-to-earth," detailed calculating. We are faced with a paradox: High-ranking speakers call upon the people to display all-nation cooperation, they talk about the impossibility of economic reforms without mutual consent; but nobody has yet published a detailed layout of losses and compensations for real families after the proposed price increase. How can the people express their opinions without such knowledge?

While we are waiting for such detailed estimates, I asked the USSR State Committee for Labor to come up with general data on the compensation as well as on the losses caused by the food price increases for an "imaginary" average family of three (husband, wife, and a 10-year old child). Here is the picture I received. According to experts of the USSR State Committee for Labor, the food price increases will mean additional monthly family expenses of R35.1 per adult and R35.8 for a 10-year old child. These estimates are based on the recommendations of the Nutrition Institute which outline the correlation in the food consumption of a child and a grown-up. For adults they used their minimum consumer's budget, for children—the rational one. Using such methods they calculated that a family of three would suffer a loss of R106 a month due to the increase in food prices. What about the compensation? One version offers R45 per adult and R35 per child between six and 12 years of age. That makes R125. In other words the family gains R19 (or R228 a year). This sum will be used to cover some of the increased expenses on the manufactured goods.

However, I would like to make some essential comments here. First, it is suggested that compensation be paid only for those foods that are sold in government stores. But in many cities and villages meat disappeared from regular stores years ago and anything bought in consumer cooperative stores or in farmers' markets will not be compensated for though, undoubtedly, the prices there will rise considerably. Another thing: They do not intend to offer any compensation for increases in the prices of gourmet foods like caviar, smoked sturgeon, etc. But this particular increase will provide R4 billion out of the total sum of R112 billion resulting from the food price raises.

But forget the gourmet food. How will the price raises affect the family budget if we think of realistic, not minimum, consumption and if we also take into consideration the purchases in the state cooperatives and in the farmers' market? I was not given any official figures, so let us try to do some calculating ourselves.

Recently the USSR State Committee for Statistics made public the results of their research on family budgets. According to these data a family of blue- or white-collar workers spent an average of R49.3 on food per person a month. That was true in 1988. Now we spend more because of higher prices but let us base our calculations on this sum for lack of other figures.

So, we take the same family of three: the parents and a 10-year old child. Let us suppose that the husband draws a salary of R260 which is close to the average statistical pay. The wife is paid R190. The family budget is R450. They spend R145 a month on food—according to the statistical data blue- and white-collar workers spend on food about one-third of their family budget, or, to be more exact, 32.2 percent.

Let us look now at how the intended price increase will affect their expenses. In 1988 every month a family of three spent an average of R10.38 on bread, R36.83 on meat, R17.54 on milk, R4.03 on fish, R13.5 on sugar and sweets, R5.29 on eggs, R2.43 on vegetable oil and other kinds of fat; they also spent R17.6 eating out. All in all it came to about R145—including vegetables, fruits, etc.

It has been suggested to approximately double the retail food prices.

Here are the approximately planned prices: First category beef—R5.5 a kilo, second category pork—R4.2, first category lamb—R4.7, milk (present price is 28 kopecks)—50 kopecks, butter (present price R3.5)—R6.5, cheese (presently R3.4)—R6.00, rye bread (now 12 kopecks a kilo)—36 kopecks a kilo, a 0.5 kilo loaf of white bread (now 25 kopecks)—74 kopecks, sugar (now R0.9)—R1.5, macaroni (now R0.42)—R1.2, vegetable oil (now R1.7)—R2.5, mackerel (now 50 kopecks)—80 kopecks....

Anyone with the time and the desire can calculate the increased expenses after the price raises, at least for bread, meat, milk, fish, sugar and sweets, and vegetable oil. He just has to use the data given by our Prime Minister N.I.Ryzhkov in his report. An average statistical family of three will require an additional R105 (all in all 2.3 times more than now). This is only for basic foods. Total losses from food purchases will be no less than R145.

Let us look at how the family can be compensated for this. According to the above mentioned first version, they will get R125. That money covers everything: All compensation for losses due to increased prices of food as well as of manufactured goods. But even to compensate for the food expenses they need R20 more.

Now about the second version—15 percent of the salary but not less than R45, rather than a lump sum. In this case the parents will get R80 for themselves and R35 for the child—all in all R115. As you can see there is no complete compensation here either.

All of us understand perfectly well that certain sacrifices can not be avoided when we are trying to break out of the crisis and there is no other way out but to the market economy. But still, let us publish the estimates, let us present them for general discussion. And let us say honestly: We are facing this and that, the standard of our life will go down by, say, 10 or 15 percent. And let us consider the government approaches that have already been made public and think all together how to protect the people with low incomes first of all; let us think what we can do to ensure that our considerable future sacrifices are not in vain.

The transfer to a regulated market will allow our store shelves to fill with time, it will help us develop the entrepreneurial spirit. The people will finally get the stimuli to work effectively and one's financial well-being and success in life will depend on the person himself and not on someone else.

But now, at this difficult and controversial period of our history, what we need mainly is an open and honest dialog with the people. Otherwise we will fail to reach a nation-wide accord and that could turn into a catastrophe for our country.

Shatalin Comments on Market, Federation Rebirth

904A0363A Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian No 20, 16 May 90 p 10

[Report on interview with Stanislav Shatalin, academician of the USSR Academy of Sciences and member of the Presidential Council, by Vladimir Sokolov, economics and science editor of LITERATURNAYA GAZETA : "What Can Save the Country"]

[Text] Saving the country? There is no question more important than that today. Although many are convinced (and energetically try to persuade others) that it is more important to fill the shelves with goods and our bellies with food. Other worthy people, even entire ethnic groups, now believe that only by withdrawing from the Union will they be able to gain freedom from the bureaucrats, build up their own cities, heal nature, and start to work on belated geographical discoveries. Still others are constantly pointing to Britain as an example of gentlemanly concern for colonies which (the concern) was to the advantage not only of the colonies but above all to the people of the metropolis itself, its standard of living, peace, and authority. Of course there are still many other types who maliciously consider their own immediate interests to be the most important and mandatory for immediate satisfaction, and they consider the concept of the "state" to be archaic, harmful, and almost doomed already, for that is what is propounded at the rallies.

Yet there are fatally serious arguments that tell us that the personal destinies of all 300 million of our compatriots—from Klaypeda to Vladivostok and from Murmansk to Kushka—regardless of nationality or religion, are inextricably linked to the destiny of the country as a unified whole. The state has withstood the monstrous social experiment of Stalinism, gone through a world war, and continued to develop in spite of the numbing senselessness of five-year plans, campaigns, and construction projects of the century, and it has not been overcome by famine, it has not burned up in an exchange of nuclear attacks, and, finally, it has found within itself the force of self-purification from the pollution of totalitarianism—and all this, regardless of what they may say at today's rally, is because of the mutual tolerance of our peoples, because of the mutually augmenting wealth and productive force of our territories.

Is this true or not? We decided to discuss this with a member of the Presidential Council, Academician S.S. Shatalin. Naturally, the discussion began with a situation with on the whole seems to deny the possibility of preserving the state—the self-withdrawal of Lithuania.

[Shatalin] In purely human terms, said Stanislav Sergeyevich, it pains me to witness this drama. The more so since I have many friends and students in Lithuania. But as a professional economist I immediately begin to calculate where it is advantageous for them to withdraw or disadvantageous. And I am not the only one who must make this calculation; other economists must do the same thing, above all Lithuanian ones. And the result should probably be taken into account when preparing the corresponding documents.

I know Kazimiera Prunskiene, I have spoken with her, and I consider her an intelligent economist. Once I said to her: You are promising the people a great deal, what will you do after they secede? You have neither your own nor Soviet money, not to mention hard currency. The first thing you will have to deal with are the enterprises that are located on your land, and they will take more from you than you say the center did. And you will shake up the peasants a great deal, too. Other nations have already gone through all this, and nobody manages to deceive history. Under these conditions will you have the national harmony without which you cannot change peacefully over to the market? So you will oppress the simple resident with taxes and demands for loyalty so much that they will regard their "colonial" past as lost freedom.

[Sokolov] In our conversation with you last year ("Costs Are Inevitable, but..." LITERATURNAYA GAZETA, No. 41, 1989), we spoke about the inevitable growth of centrifugal forces and their striving to break republics away from the Union. And now in the Baltic republics the process has developed to the point where their example is inspiring others that we "welded together forever." What forces today might be considered centripetal? What can keep the country from collapse?

[Shatalin] The market. A real, full-blooded market and a strong economy could remove 98.1 percent of all the problems that are plaguing us. Therefore the path to the market is the path to salvation of the federation.

[Sokolov] Stop, Stanislav Sergeyevich. Let us think about this. We can see that in almost all the republics—not excluding Russia—the programs of the opposition are based on the idea of separation. And almost everywhere these politicians are opposed by businessmen and leaders of large, by no means market, enterprises and branches that are involved in the unionwide complex. They have one means of opposition—striking. And the local politicians say to them: Wonderful, boys, go ahead and strike; your counterparts in the Union will suffer and the empire will collapse all the sooner.

[Shatalin] Yes, that is what will happen with centralized distribution of resources and profit. If the republic itself disposes of the taxes from the enterprises, it is very indifferent to the fact that the strikes cost millions each day. In this case the market has a strong influence on politicians—although, it is true, not on politickers.

[Sokolov] But let us look into the not too distant future. For instance Lithuania and some plant that provides the entire country with its unique product. A market? Excellent. An American will show up and say: I will buy this plant and put dollars on the barrel head. After which he will tear down the plant (the West does not need antediluvian engines) and build a new one in which he will produce highly technical, small, costly engines for video equipment to be delivered to South Korea. Obviously, there will be only 2,000 people working at his plant instead of 12,000, and it will be mainly non-Lithuanians who end up unemployed. How will this kind of market help save the federation?

[Shatalin] Your little problem contains certain incorrect conditions, Vladimir Nikolayevich. Try to find the mistake yourself.

[Sokolov] Well, let me guess. The market of "market" countries has to compete with the rest of the world, and in order to become a supplier for South Korea it must produce motors with better quality and lower costs than the competitors'. That is unlikely at this point.

[Shatalin] Correct. What else?

[Sokolov] Lithuania will have to maintain raw material and energy ties with us as long as it can—nobody will sell them these vitally important raw materials more cheaply than we will. And nobody will purchase their food and goods of lesser quality than we will

[Shatalin] Precisely. Therefore the American will not take over a plant the Union needs, will not tear it down, and will not reconstruct it according to his own wishes. This can be possible only under a trilateral agreement that is advantageous both to Lithuania and to us and to the hypothetical American.

In general I wish to note that the reorientation of the Baltic republics to the West is far from as simple a trick as some politicians make it out to be. It will take many millions of dollars and many years to significantly restructure industry and raise technology and productivity to a competitive level. How are they going to pay for this? And without restructuring what can the Baltic states deliver to the capitalist countries? Except for Sabonis [Lithuanian basketball player], whom I love, who can always be sold for hard currency.

The scientific and technical potential of the small republics is a special item. Of course there is by no means enough of it for an independent break into serious markets. They simply do not have the critical scientific mass; this is not Japan with its population of 100 million and their ability to work like fanatics. So they need someone's constant assistance, an infusion of knowledge, ideas, and resources. And the Union is now beginning to increase its scientific and technical might and the export potential of its technologies, and I do not think that any of the republics stands to lose anything from participating in this process.

[Sokolov] One of the manias that have taken over the minds of the "separatists" is that they do not want to feed Moscow (the Caucasus, the Baltics, Central Asia, and so forth). Will the market help them get away from this?

[Shatalin] This is simply incompatible with the market. The market seeks new consumers and tries as hard as it can, using the most refined advertising, to "feed" them regardless of their nationalities. Unfortunately, this mania has spread over our country in a distorted form. We Russians, say, feed the Central Asian peoples.... For shame. We must put a stop to these facile discussions because they are radically wrong, unobjective, and they only insult entire nations and evoke hostility. And the hostility naturally seeks forms of national self-defense, and in our uncivilized country these forms turn out to be the most barbaric, which undermines the economy—and the deterioration of the economy inflames national hostility even more. This kind of snowball effect can lead us so far astray that we will not be able to find where we started or who was to blame. In general there is no point in raising the question of who feeds whom in our country. Let the best comrades from Estonia come to Uzbekistan in September and see how children are hunched up under the scorching sun harvesting the cotton from which the Marat factory makes its remarkable knitwear.

[Sokolov] This is true, Stanislav Sergeyevich. But some people see this same cotton as a guarantee of the future flourishing of their republics—under the condition, of course, that they secede and enter the world market independently.

[Shatalin] That is a mistake. There is not a single union republic that has a single kind of agricultural product whose quality and price make it possible to win in the stiff competition on the world market and become a significant export item. The cotton from Central Asia, which is grown the farthest north in the world, will always be harder to grow than Indian or Egyptian cotton. Georgian tea cannot be any better or more profitable than Ceylonese or Chinese. Holland is capable of providing inexpensive milk for all the Baltic area, but the other side of the bargain (if it makes any sense) will require deep restructuring of the meat and dairy industry of the Baltic republics and the labor of more than one generation of farmers—as was the case in Holland.

There is no need to look far for an example. Hungary, whose agriculture is many times better than Lithuania's, has stable exports of $1.4 billion a year and they think that as a nation on the whole they are in a very difficult position. Their industry is half dead, they do not have any important inventions of their own, no technological breakthroughs are anticipated, and their debts are growing.

[Sokolov] Well, all right, not agriculture and not their own inventions, but what about the role of a technological corridor between West and East which the new leaders are promising the Baltic republics?

[Shatalin] Does the West need such a corridor? What is keeping them from locating any enterprise at the exact point in the Union where it is most needed? If it is advantageous to put it in Latvia, go ahead. But if it is more advantageous in Novgorod or Samarkand, excuse me, but what good is Latvia here? It would never enter anyone's mind to use its territory for significant large-scale technology—without its own energy, without raw material, and without traditions....

And everything you and I are discussing, Vladimir Nikolayevich, we are discussing within the framework of the right we recognize for the people of the republic to determine their own destiny. This is not the issue. It is another matter that the logic of the struggle leads certain politicians away from slogans "on behalf of the people" and "for the good of the people" to subordination of the interests of the people to their own political and even personal interests. The people become small change for them.

[Sokolov] Are we "driving mankind to happiness with an iron fist"?

[Shatalin] We have already seen all this. We have had it up to our ears with such politicians. I do not wish to accuse any of the republic or union activists; I wish to ask: Think about whether or not the interests of one people or another have become a screen for the achievement of your own ambitions.

[Sokolov] Yet the ambitions did not occur of their own accord; they were determined by the environment in which the future politicians grew up and were educated; and here we see asserted under the banners of democracy all the same good old totalitarianism only instead of communist it is, say, Moldavian. The innate vices of our system are restored and even raised to a new level by the holy idea of national rebirth.

[Shatalin] But we must also see the other side of our processes. While striving during the course of perestroyka to create a strong, modern, dynamic, and democratic country, we must make sure that we do not fall into the trap of imperialist thinking. It was inherent in Russia previously as well, and during the Soviet period we, frankly, strengthened it. "There" it is nationalism, "here" it is chauvinism, centralism. "We shall not allow anyone to undermine our greatness," and so forth. This imperialist philosophy must also be eradicated; we do not have the right for its sake to risk more significant values. After all, we do not want to become imperially stronger, but simply stronger, richer, wiser, and freer. I raise both hands in favor of this interpretation of the meaning of great power.

[Sokolov] Stanislav Sergeyevich, before our eyes we are seeing changes in ideological tenets not only in the former socialist countries but also in the republics of the Union, individual regions of it, and even in large cities. The single red color of "proletarian solidarity" has been replaced by a rainbow of national flags, "turbulent applause" has been drowned out by the sound of rocks hitting protective shields or the rumble of rounds from automatic weapons. Our reciprocal deliveries with East Europe have almost not changed. Within the Union, in spite of the verbiage on economic accountability and free partnerships, reliable contracting agents have come to be valued perhaps even more than before. And at this moment it is distinctly clear that the diversity of ideologies combines excellently with the general structure of the economy. Lithuania is departing while politically retaining the kolkhozes [collective farms] and sovkhozes [state farms] and insisting that their economic ties with the Union remain the same. Azerbaijan and Armenia have become involved in fierce antagonism and two kinds of fanatical religious fundamentalism have come into conflict but they continue to exchange products with the Union and also directly with one another! Do these examples not show that at the economic level the territories and the peoples of our country long ago formed a stable system of ties that guarantee survival come what may?

[Shatalin] Of course they do. Although this level of management is so low that the contradictions and conflicts among the partners began to be generated of their own accord. It is possible to raise it, as has already been said a thousand times, only by changing over to market relations, and it is easier to do this together than for each to do it separately according to his own idea.

Personally, I am convinced that a full-fledged, rapid economic and national rebirth is possible only within the framework of the federation where the republics, however many there are and whatever their degree of independence—right up to the point of membership in the United Nations—will help one another gain freedom from persecution for having different ideas and the possibility of going to regional and world markets, jointly solving economic problems, and elevating the culture and education of their peoples. This is axiomatic for an economist.

But we must finally recognize and accommodate the natural differences between the Orthodox, Protestants, Shiites, Sunnis, Jews, Buddhists, and people of cultures with other religious roots and stop trying to reduce them all to a common denominator—even if it has to do with the market. In different places people live with different traditions, labor skills, and myths, and with varying degrees of ideologization of awareness. The terribly varying level of education from people to people and in the country as a whole is a gap in comparison to the level of developed states. It is necessary to educate the population and train cultural workers and literate specialists—this is not the function of the market, it is the function of the federation. And public health? Is, say, Tajikistan or Georgia capable of developing all the necessary areas at a high level? Some of them—yes, all of them—impossible. For an eye operation it is necessary to go to Fedorov or to America. In either case you need hard currency, don't you. And if you are a simple cotton grower or vineyard worker? This and many other things are not very well thought out in the current euphoria.

Oh boy—the trifles of life. It is all the same totalitarian thinking, endless sacrifices in the name of a bright future, but what will happen to you and your children tomorrow—it is no fun to think about it.

[Sokolov] But here is another thing I would like to discuss, Stanislav Sergeyevich. Our powerful arms which are spread throughout all of the republics comprise a separate problem for changing over to a real federation. And the military industrial complex has spread its wings, as they say... The army unites these facilities and enterprises into such an immense, such an organized force that all the other superpowers and just plain powers find it difficult to reckon with. Of course, this force is under the control of the state, but it is the current state which occupies one-sixth of the globe. And if the state starts to disintegrate will the army want to disintegrate in its wake or will it prefer to take control over the weakened state?

Moreover, nuclear power stations and chemical combines are spread throughout the republics. In the event of an unforeseen shutdown or accident they present an ecological threat not only for this territory—Chernobyl has proven this—but also on a global scale. How can the existence of such gigantic centralized complexes, frequently deadly ones, be combined with the right of the nations to self-determination which was proclaimed in 1922 when the Kashirskaya GRES [hydroelectric power plant] was the pride of energy engineering?

[Shatalin] You state the problem correctly—the military system, good or bad, exists and it forces us to reckon with it. We have located various facilities and arms in various republics in such a way that they comprise a kind of whole. Here we must look the facts straight in the eye. People will say: We did not give you permission to locate these facilities there; you did not ask us. No, they were not asked and, no, they did not give their permission, but they are a fact, they exist.

In general the problem of the army and arms is not an economic problem. The market can improve conditions for maintaining military servicemen and technical equipment and provide for a high level of military preparation. But the numbers, composition, and location of the units as well as military doctrines—these are purely political issues.

[Sokolov] But the politicians in the republics provide them with an economic base. I was told in Lithuania: Take away your soldiers but your military facilities and arms must stay because the labor of our people was invested in them as well. They will provide a material basis for our own armed forces.

[Shatalin] It is naive to count on that—to leave missiles to anybody so that they can turn around and direct them at you, at Norway, or the FRG! Moreover, according to that logic, Turkmenia or, say, the Kamchatka Oblast soviet should also become nuclear powers—in what way are they worse than Lithuania?

[Sokolov] Not to mention the fact that pressure from the republics in this direction could lead to the most severe confrontation of military forces which will try to use their means to "remove" this problem altogether.

[Shatalin] And as concerns the large civilian facilities that present a possible threat, their fate should be decided in negotiations on the republic's withdrawal from the Union. The parties should make mutual commitments that guarantee safe and effective operation of these facilities and create all the necessary conditions for meeting them. To achieve this they should try to maintain good relations and aggravate one another in any way. If war breaks out we shall all be equally poor, equally right, and equally to blame, and therefore ordinary common sense and our survival instinct should become factors in our unity.

[Sokolov] But enough about horrors, Stanislav Sergeyevich. Is there really nothing except threats and necessity that joins us of the same generation together? Take this same national factor—after all, it not only tears the country apart but in some paradoxical way is uniting us as well. The nations are diffused not only on the territories of other republics but also in one another's blood—there is an immense number of mixed marriages. Except for Armenia and Lithuania, everywhere, including Russia, "national minorities" comprise from one-third to one-half of the population (and in autonomous republics up to nine-tenths!) and everywhere they are actively resisting the very idea of separation. What are they, great power chauvinists to a man? Good Lord! The people think about this in simpler terms—I feel at home here, I am equal to my neighbor, and out of charity I will tolerate him (if he tolerates me), and for my neighbor I will be the "buffer zone" of the adjacent state. With this kind of prospect "imperialist thinking" is aroused in the Yakut in the Ukraine, the Siberian Uzbek, and the Muscovite Armenians, Georgians, and Lithuanians. For "national minorities" who have put down roots in "foreign" republics, the arguments of "their" politicians do not hold water—this has nothing to do with us, and the appeals of these separatists here appealing to the national feelings of the "indigenous" population are perceived as a threat to the normal course of life.

And there is another most significant circumstance which, it seems to me, should contribute to preserving the Union—world public opinion. Whether anybody likes the "empire" or not, everyone understands that perestroyka was started and is being conducted by the entire Union and not Kazakhstan and not Abkhazia. The Union, following its chosen course, is a much more reliable partner in political, military, and economic agreements than two or three dozen dwarf states eaten up by several larger ones. I am not talking about the danger to mankind of any of our internecine quarrels, any conspiracies, squabbles, or uprisings—these are like playing with matches around a powder keg. It is vitally necessary for the world that there be civil peace in the Union—is this not true?

[Shatalin] I will go further: The world knows and values the talent of our peoples, their ability to solve problems, and their biological and cultural gene pool. Without exception all Western businessmen, politicians, and bankers with whom I have spoken in my new position as a member of the Presidential Council assert: We need a strong, stable, democratic, market-based Soviet Union. None of them believes that the danger of war can arise from such a Union. It is objectively more advantageous for the West to deal with a consistently predictable large country which has an immense market, a developed culture, proven scientific and technical potential, an infrastructure, powerful energy, and its own raw material supplies.

But I wish to note also that, besides nationalist movements there are other political forces in the center who, because of various considerations, support the separatist aspirations of the republics. We must not remain silent about them when discussing consolidation.

Many of those who call themselves radicals are sincere in their political convictions. But not all of them. For certain people "radical" democracy is the possibility with the help of demagogues to win power for themselves and nothing else. Life has provided thousands of examples of how people who have promised the flourishing of justice have ended by becoming cruel tyrants and despots. I shall not name names.

[Sokolov] Everyone can make his own list.

[Shatalin] Now both "left" and "right" wingers promise a flourishing. It is known that extremes frequently converge at the most unexpected points, and here radical "leftists" are energetically welcoming the withdrawal of republics from the Union, seeing in this a progressive process of collapse of the totalitarian empire and radical "rightists" just as energetically call for the withdrawal of Mother Russia from their "younger brothers" who are supposed to be parasites. The points of departure seem to be different but the result is the same—breaking of economic ties, a decline in the standard of living, even more hostility among peoples, and the end of perestroyka. A civil war in a country filled with launch complexes and nuclear power plants—this is not something you can handle with a cavalry charge.... History repeats itself but not as a farce nor even as a tragedy but as a super-tragedy.

[Sokolov] And we are all hostages of each other.

[Shatalin] And if we do not find a way of reaching an agreement with one another now, my grandson will have every right to spit on my grave and say: So you, grandfather, were a Russian academician and were unable to save the country.... That is, if my grandson exists.

[Sokolov] And if your grave exists.

[Shatalin] Unfortunately, such an outcome is still possible. Therefore I am devoting all my efforts to influencing both the "left" and the "right."

[Sokolov] We shall hope, Stanislav Sergeyevich, that the great history of our state will not end with our intolerance and imprudence.

[Shatalin] We shall hope and work.

'Mir' Business Cooperation Association Formed

LD0406154390 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0919 GMT 4 Jun 90

[Text] Moscow, 4 Jun (TASS)—The "International Intellectual Markets," business cooperation association, whose Russian abbreviation, Mir—which means peace—has been set up to promote electronic marketing in the Soviet Union. Founders of the association are the joint ventures "Novinteks" and "Serveko," the International Scientific and Technical Information Center, Flight Control Center, and others.

More than 200 enterprises want to join the asociation, which offers electronic mediation, access to international data bases, marketing on the European market, a stock exchange of intellectual resources, and other services. An agreement on representation at Informat, Paris which connects more than 270 firms from around the world, has been signed.

Tenkinskiy Gold Industry Faces Problems

LD0406154490 Moscow Television Service in Russian 0830 GMT 4 Jun 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [Announcer] Today, on the eve of transition to the regulated market economy, stable reinforcement of the country's gold reserve is of particular importance. The market thus demands gold, and the gold extraction workers, as you will now see, are impatiently waiting for real market relations.

[Correspondent V. Rezinovskiy] [video shows dredging work] Last season brought a profit of R8 million. An increase in profit, almost three times over, is planned for this season. This involves a reduction of management cadres, elimination of loss-making plants, setting up of transport cooperatives and a number of other measures.

Stepan Kondratiyevich, tell me, please, what is the main feature of this panning season?

[S.K. Yevseyev, director of Tenkinskiy Mining and Concentration Combine, identified by caption] [video shows Yevseyev interviewed outdoors, in desolate landscape, with installations behind, drilling in mud under way] The main feature is that we are working this year conditions of self-financing, self-recouping, that is, without subsidies.

[Rezinovskiy] This is a stage, new in principle, in the development of the mining industry, isn't it?

[Yevseyev] Yes, completely new.

[Rezinovskiy] Well, this new stage, probably is accompanied by some old problems. What are they?

[Yevseyev] There are of course many problems. Above all, I would mention unsatisfactory material and technical provision. Secondly, the mining industry is expecting machine-builders to provide them with modern and productive mining equipment.

[Rezinovskiy] Who is letting you down on the mainland, what enterprises? [Yevseyev] The Cheboksary tractor manufacturing plant is letting us down on the mainland, and the Volgograd Motor plant.

[Rezinovskiy] [video shows panning operations, dredging, three women shaking gold nuggets in trays in a room] It seems that the introduction of market relations should put an end to humiliating dependence on unscrupulous suppliers. But will this ever come? The recent rise in gold prices has already been swallowed up by the rise in prices of equipment of the monopoly plants. Miners having renounced state subsidies, have every right to hope that the ministry will meet them half-way. Self-recouping and self-financing should be accompanied by expansion of the sphere of independence. But the main obstacle on the way to this—normative methods of distribution of profit, the legacy of the administrative command economy—remains unshaken.

Military

Panafidin Denies Bias Against Uzbek Draftees

PM0406092990 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 31 May 90 First Edition p 1

[Interview with Colonel A. Panafidin, department chief of the Ground Forces Combat Training Main Directorate, by correspondent Lieutenant Colonel I. Yesyutin; place, date not stated; first two paragraphs are introduction: "There Is No 'Unprestigious' Service"]

[Text] It can be seen from an analysis of the editorial mail that in recent days there has been an increasing number of letters from Uzbekistan with questions about how the writers' fellow countrymen are serving. There are also little notes of alarm regarding the social state of servicemen of Uzbek nationality in the army collectives and of the alleged infringement taking place in their allocation among the branches of the Armed Forces and categories of troops, their appointment to second-rate posts, and their high injury rate during combat training....

Your KRASNAYA ZVEZDA correspondent asked Colonel A. Panafidin, department chief of the Ground Forces Combat Training Main Directorate, to comment on this concern.

[Yesyutin] Aleksandr Semenovich, I should like you, as our mail inclines us to do, to talk of the servicemen drafted from the Central Asian republics and in particular from Uzbekistan.....

[Panafidin] Talk specially.... You realize that in my view the actual raising of this question is totally unfounded. Servicemen of the most diverse nationalities serve in all branches of the Armed Forces and categories of troops. But who in the Army looks at your service through the prism of nationality? They look to see what kind of a soldier or officer you are! I know from your own personal experience—and I have commanded both a platoon and a regiment and I have been deputy commander of a division—I can say that I have never seen bad fighters from Uzbekistan—or I don't remember any, at any rate.

[Yesyutin] Good, but did you notice? Some letters seem to contain something like a grievance: Young Uzbeks are sent to serve mainly in the ground forces units and construction battalions, it is claimed....

[Panafidin] I shall explain why this impression arises. Approximately one-quarter of the present draft reserve consists of young men from our southern republics. That is the demographic situation in the country. And where, in which category of troops, is there the greatest demand for soldiers? The navy, the missile troops, air defense, and air force consist mainly of cadre specialists and professionals: officers, ensigns, warrant officers, and those on extended military service. Only a relatively small contingent of draftees is sent there. And I accept that only a small percentage of the republic's total contingent of draftees serves there. The lion's share of soldiers serve in the motorized rifle, armored, and artillery units and in communications. And in the construction battalions, too. So there is no "big policy" here.

[Yesyutin] But some writers claim that service in, let us say, the "unprestigious" units has an effect on the way a person feels. Hence, they say, the injury rate and other bad things....

[Panafidin] I think the thesis of the lack of prestige of service in the Ground Forces comes from obsolete concepts. The modern motorized rifle, armored, and other troops of our category are troops mostly with a full complement of the most progressive equipment. The modern tank and infantry combat vehicle are powerful fire complexes stuffed with electronics and complex systems. Really mastering them is not that simple. And if we are speaking of the way a person feels as the result of what now surrounds the motorized rifleman in his service, then there is still a big reserve here for the application of his powers and knowledge, skills, and abilities. But, incidentally, being in the units by virtue of my service and meeting with the servicemen, I have never once heard them mention the lack of prestige of their service.... In my opinion this problem has been made up.

[Yesyutin] And the injury rate?

[Panafidin] The injury rate is also linked in the most direct way with the standard of mastery and handling of equipment.

[Yesyutin] There is the opinion that injury is inevitable in combat training and it is claimed that a specific percentage rate of injury is even envisaged in planning....

[Panafidin] Excuse me, but how can you plan human casualties? That is immoral and unethical. No one in our Army has ever engaged or is engaged in this. We engage in something else—concern to ensure that not a single person suffers during combat training.

[Yesyutin] Yet it does happen....

[Panafidin] To our common sorrow, yes. It does happen. Every case of serious injury connected with people's crippling or death during combat training is investigated by us to ascertain the circumstances in which it occurred and what had attended it.

Where enormous masses of people are dealing with equipment and weapons and where people's standard of initial training and instruction is uneven, it is difficult to completely avoid injury, including the most serious forms of injury. For instance, compare how many people in the country die in automobile accidents. And after all the Army too is essentially entirely on wheels.

It has now become fashionable to defame the Army. And it is probably to some people's advantage to come up with one more thesis in order to stigmatize it with a force insensitive to another's grief.

Border Guards' Work at Polish Crossing Profiled

PM3005153990 Moscow Television Service in Russian 0830 GMT 29 May 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast: V. Lyashko, A. Shubin reportage from Soviet-Polish border crossing]

[Text] [Announcer] Here is a report by our correspondents [V. Lyashko, A. Shubin identified by caption] on customs service work in the new conditions.

[Lyashko] This is the Soviet-Polish border sector at Shaginya. More than 3 million people cross the state border at this road crossing every year. All sorts of things happen here, of course. [video shows people waiting at crossing point] Attempts by our compatriots to leave on forged visas or other people's passports have multiplied in particular of late. In the last few days this attractive girl, warrant officer Maria Mikhaela, has detained five border violators presenting forged documents [video shows girl and close-up of documents]. Forgery techniques are becoming more and more sophisticated. This is why the border guards devote so much time to studying this illicit business, which has become a lucrative occupation today. Since the beginning of the year alone, border guards at the Mostiska checkpoint in cooperation with the customs service have seized almost R6 million worth of contraband. [video shows contraband, including guns]

And as for narcotics and explosives this spaniel [video shows spaniel and alsatian in kennel], who is preparing for his next stint on the border with his handler, has no rival. There is more than enough work for everyone here.

Impact of Economic Reform on Defense Sector

90UM0602A Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 19 May 90 First Edition p 2

[Article by Colonel V. Aksenov, candidate of economic sciences: "Transition to a Market Economy: The Defense Aspect"]

[Text] A set of measures providing for the considerable acceleration of a transition to a regulated market in our economy has been submitted for consideration to the Third Session of the USSR Supreme Soviet. The radicalization of the economic reform will influence profoundly all aspects of life of Soviet society—including the sphere of economic support for the defense of our country.

What are the possible consequences of this influence? To what degree should they be taken into account in the course of the forthcoming military reform? The consideration of these issues by the author makes no claim to being complete and final. This is rather an invitation to a conversation on an acute and pressing problem.

So, our economy is on the eve of profound changes. On the instructions of the president of the country, the USSR Council of Ministers has worked out a package of measures aimed at a considerable acceleration of our transition to a regulated market economy. In the process the deadlines have been radically revised, and the content of stages of the program of economic invigoration adopted by the USSR Supreme Soviet in December 1989 has been made more specific.

What compelled the government to change so rapidly its point of view on the prospects of economic policy? An answer is found in the analysis of the socioeconomic situation which has now emerged. For the first time in many years, the Goskomstat [State Committee for Statistics] registered a decline in the absolute volume of production. Compared to the same period of 1989, in the first quarter of 1990 the national income declined by two percent, and the overall volume of production of industrial output by 1.2 percent; plans were fulfilled only for 56 types of products out of 164 main types.

Simultaneously with a decline in the output of products, an entire set of socioeconomic problems became more acute. Financial difficulties mounted. Contributions to the budget from profits declined rapidly and, which is particularly dangerous, the profits of enterprises began to decline (by 7.4 percent in the quarter). Under the circumstances the state was forced to expand the emission of currency. Compared to the first quarter of 1989, its volume increased by more than one quarter.

The situation in the consumer market did not improve. The rapid growth of merchandise sales (R13.1 billion) occurred to a considerable degree on an unhealthy basis. It reflected not only an increase in the volume of production and the sale of goods and services, but also an increase in average retail prices, an increment in alcohol sales, and sales of considerable amounts of goods on a noncash basis. Increases in the delivery of imported goods (R8.2 billion) also played an essential role. Despite the acuteness of shortages of some goods (sugar and detergents) declining, new shortages replaced them. The stocks of fabrics and footwear in trade establishments began to dwindle; the production of cigarettes, razor blades, and pencils declined.

A further increase in the inflation rate which came to about eight percent compared to the first quarter of last year is a general indicator of economic instability.

At present, a considerable weakening of labor discipline may be mentioned as one of the main causes of this situation. At issue are primarily mass strikes. In September of last year, when the miners strike was at its peak, an average of 100,000 people per day did not work, in the first quarter of this year it was as many as 180,000. Direct production losses alone—including work not performed—amounted to R820 million. It is no accident that at the end of March, when the tension in Transcaucasia began to abate, the decline of production became slower.

Current difficulties are also associated with the continuing restructuring of industry. The economy is increasingly geared to social objectives. The production of the means of consumption (Group B) increased by 4.7 percent compared to the same period of last year whereas the production of the means of production (Group A) declined by 3.2 percent over the same period of time.

The influence of the process of conversion which is under way is temporarily negative. The reduced production of armaments is not always successfully offset in full by the civilian output. Given the considerable scale of conversion measures, this is a problem not only of individual enterprises but also of the economy as a whole.

However, as I see it, the incomplete nature of the processes of economic reform is the main cause of the deteriorating economic situation. A paradoxical situation emerged when the traditional administrative system of management is no longer capable of supporting the reproduction process in a regular manner whereas conditions for the effective operation of market mechanisms have not been created yet. A peculiar situation of "economic power vacuum" has emerged.

Under the circumstances, attempts to stabilize the situation through the use of traditional measures were not perceptibly effective. A tax on the increment of wages proposed by the government as an anti-inflationary device turned out to have little effect. It embraced only one-fifth of the enterprises for which it was meant, and could not stem the flood of actually unearned money. Instead of the planned 7.3-percent increment, the monetary income of the populace increased by 13.3 percent (R17.6 billion) in the first quarter of this year, outstripping the rate of growth of consumer spending. This happened against the background of declining production.

The need to considerably speed up the processes of transition to a market economy developed objectively. The schedule of our transition to the regulated market was moved up to the beginning of 1991. Twelve laws, three USSR Supreme Soviet resolutions, and 14 Council of Ministers resolutions will have to be adopted in order for this process to be of a controlled nature.

The laws on the freedom of economic operations and the development of enterprise, on the reform of pricing, on the fundamentals of antimonopoly legislation, on foreign investment, and so on are among priority measures. Corresponding amendments will have to be made in the USSR Laws "On State Enterprises (Associations)" and "On Cooperatives in the USSR."

With a view to ensuring the social protection of workers in the period of our transition to the market economy, laws are being developed on the employment of the populace and on indexing incomes taking into account changes in prices for consumer goods and services, as well as a USSR Supreme Soviet resolution on the social protection of low-income citizens and on the organization of food supply in the environment of market relations. A number of documents will regulate the very process of transition to the regulated market.

As the authors of the program estimate, with the introduction of these legislative acts the necessary conditions will be created for the development of a full-fledged market in our country which includes markets of the means of production and consumer goods, securities and credit, labor, and currency. This will make it possible to start up a mechanism of healthy competition and, having overcome crisis phenomena, make our economy dynamic.

Undoubtedly, an overall improvement in the economic situation in the country, greater efficiency of social production, and improvements in the quality of output, which the market holds promise of, will favorably influence the economic support of the necessary level of defense capability of the country and the implementation of the strategy of defense sufficiency. At the same time, even now it can be expected that a number of problems will arise in the defense sector of the economy. To my mind it is feasible to provide for their solution in advance, within the framework of the military reform which is being prepared.

First of all, serious changes will occur in the defense complex of the country. For a long time this sphere of the economy experienced virtually no difficulties with resources. As M.S. Gorbachev stressed speaking in Nizhniy Tagil, "the share of military expenditures in our country reached 18 percent of the national income, which does not occur in any other state in the world."

Under these conditions, the economic efficiency of the enterprises of the defense complex approximately corresponds on the average to the level of the national economy as a whole, and is substantially inferior to the indicators of industrially developed countries, despite its better technological equipment, higher employee skills, and a considerable scientific potential. That is to say, a cost-oriented mechanism "held sway" here as in the entire national economy.

The transition of our economy to market relations will place the enterprises of the defense complex—including enterprises of the USSR Ministry of Defense—in an economic environment which is new in principle. Higher wholesale prices for raw materials and energy forms, equipment, and subcontracted products, growing wages, and complications in the system of economic contacts accompanying the introduction of wholesale trade in the means of production will present them with a dilemma: either a radical increase in efficiency and reductions in production costs or higher prices for armaments and materiel.

It may be expected that some enterprises will opt for the easier second path, taking advantage of their monopolistic position in the defense sector. The expanding conversion of military production will also prompt them to do so.

In the market of civilian products, the enterprises will run into quite stiff competition, and the opportunity to raise prices in this sphere will be frequently restricted. A natural desire will develop to try and solve their problems at the expense of the budget of the Ministry of Defense. The practice of initial years of work under self-capitalization and self-financing has provided many examples of this nature.

A radical restructuring of the entire economic mechanism of the defense complex is necessary in order to counteract such tendencies, endowing it, on the one hand, with cost-control features while, on the other hand, attuning it to meeting the requirements of the defense doctrine. Only a fundamental revision of the concept of a defense-economic mechanism will make it possible to accomplish one of the main tasks now facing our armed forces. In the opinion of Army General M.A. Moiseyev, chief of the General Staff of the USSR Armed Forces, its essence is "on the one hand, to be thriftier with our money and use the material resources allocated for the training and development of the Armed Forces more carefully, while, on the other hand, looking more vigorously for ways which would make it possible to maintain defense at a level of reasonable sufficiency within the framework of a reduced military budget."

The entire system of economic ties between the USSR Ministry of Defense and the enterprises of the defense complex will have to be changed substantially. Arrangements for selecting weapons systems will have to be improved considerably, primarily due to increasing sharply the role of the military-economic criterion.

Problems which are no less complex may develop in the economy of the Armed Forces as well. Given higher prices for consumer goods and services, the problem of social protection for officers, warrant officers, workers, and employees of the Soviet Army will become particularly acute. The fixed nature of their incomes and the lack of opportunities to use additional sources of income for maintaining the necessary standard of living will require that particular attention is given to arrangements for indexing their pay. Peculiarities of the area of posting, opportunities for finding jobs for family members, the degree of availability of housing, and many other factors should also be taken into account in this matter.

Many issues of operating the military economy will, perhaps, also be solved in a new manner. It is no secret that some of the material resources and foodstuffs are purchased by the units locally under requisite items of the Ministry of Defense cost schedules. The current system which excessively regulates the work of commanders in the economic sphere should undergo considerable changes in the area of prices for many types of products changing depending on the region, season, and just demand and supply. The market economy will call for a considerably greater independence of the primary element of economic operations in the troops and a radical restructuring of this block of the military economic mechanism.

I understand that the above problems do not exhaust all contradictions which may emerge in the military-economic sphere after our transition to the regulated market. Apparently, a more detailed, comprehensive analysis of the consequences of this step for the defense sector of the economy is necessary. In conjunction with this, it appears feasible to set up a temporary scientific collective which would conduct a requisite review of the package of documents proposed. Such a collective could be created at the USSR Ministry of Defense or at one of the committees of the Supreme Soviet of the country.

I believe that a debate on the pages of the military press is necessary in order to discuss in detail the theoretical and practical issues of switching to market relations in the defense sector of the economy. Discussion of the economic aspects of the forthcoming military reform presents considerable opportunities for this.

Finally, the transition of our economy to the regulated market will call for a resolute restructuring of the economic thinking of military cadres. The USSR Council of Ministers is planning to introduce substantial changes in the system of cadre training and retraining in conjunction with expected changes in the economy. I believe that it would be feasible to make corresponding changes in the training of military specialists as well, in particular, to make the study of the issues of the transition to the regulated market in the Soviet economy and their influence on the defense capability of the country a priority in the system of Marxist-Leninist training of officers and political study of warrant officers as early as the 1990/91 school year.

Soviet Aircraft Displayed at U.S. Aviation Show

LD0406123590 Moscow TASS in English 1115 GMT 4 Jun 90

[Text] Moscow June 4 TASS—The world's most powerful An-225 "Mriya" cargo plane, developed at the Antonov design bureau, the new Ka-32 helicopter and new Soviet fighter plans will be displayed at the fifth international aviation and space show in Oklahama City, which will open in mid-June.

"We expect our planes to be of interest to experts from various countries," chief of the perspective scientific research board of the Soviet Aircraft Building Industry A. Baktov told TASS. "New technologies offer broad opportunities for mutually advantageous cooperation. For instance, we invite foreign companies to take part in a very promising project—the use of 'Mriya' as a mobile launching platform for small space vehicles, including piloted craft.

"This plane has a payload of to 250 tonnes. It can carry the second stage of a booster and the vehicle itself. This project will allow us to launch space vehicles from any part of the globe. Such a system is commercially very profitable. A country, wishing to orbit a space vehicle, will need no ground launching pads. It will be simpler and cheaper to use a flying launcher.

"Our delegation, which includes experts from the country's leading design bureaus, will visit several aviation firms in the United States. Soviet and American specialists will exchange scientific and technological information. It is planned to display Soviet aircraft in Seattle, where the Boeing company is based."

'Unique' Soviet Bomber Sets World Records

LD0206161190 Moscow World Service in English 1500 GMT 2 Jun 90

[Text] The unique Soviet bomber, the Tu-142 LL, has set three world records.

For the first time ever an aircraft of this class reached an altitude of six kilometers in less than five minutes and did another two unprecedented maneuvers. This became possible after mounting on the plane an additional engine from the supersonic strategic bomber the Tu-160.

Baltic Republics

Lithuanian Economic Situation Detailed

LD0406115190 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 0900 GMT 4 Jun 90

[Correspondent Vytas Usas reports on findings of the 4 June Lithuanian Council of Ministers session; from the "Lithuanian Today" program—recorded]

[Excerpts] [Usas] The last weekend did not bring any changes to the embargo in Lithuania.

Industrial enterprises were supplied today with power without any restrictions; a reactor is operating at the Ignalina Nuclear Electric Power Station and the Lithuanian GRES [state regional electric power station] is working at minimal capacity. Incidentally, more than 1,000 tonnes of crude oil is consumed at the power station, the resources of which are rapidly diminishing.

The Minister of Industry of the republic of Lithuania said that during the previous week, production was not completely stopped at any industrial enterprise, although unemployment has risen three-four percent; individual production sections at some enterprises are being closed. [passage indistinct]

The fuel problem remains the most acute in the republic. The price for a liter of gasoline on the so-called black market rose to three rubles. A probable normal market is emerging.

In Belorussia, only transit vehicles are supplied with a restricted amount of fuel, although 10,000 tonnes of gasoline which previously had been alloted for Lithuania remain in the republic. A decision therefore has been made at the session that if Belorussia does not change its position, its cement supplies will be discontinued.

Most of our listeners must have heard already about the Lazdijai border crossing point incident in which Soviet border troops detained a fuel truck carrying gasoline for Lithuania that had been purchased in the West. I spoke some minutes ago about this to Rimantas Purtulis, general director of a republic department for economic links with foreign countries.

Esteemed director, I heard you talking after the sitting to the chief of the Lazdijai customs house. How is the wretched issue of the fuel truck loaded with gasoline being solved?.

[Purtulis] With great difficulty, and this is not because a tankful of gasoline will decide the future of Lithuania's economy or agriculture. It is our first attempt to establish some legal contact for cooperation with the officials at the customs house, which is subordinated to Moscow, and in general to find out whether or not any laws are operating. Gorbachev's letter said oil supplies from the Soviet Union to Lithuania were banned. There has been no mention of importing oil products from outside. The customs house officials answered that permission from various ministries in Moscow was needed for any deals. However, there is no legal grounds for this, because it is not required by any operating Soviet laws. At the moment I cannot give you any information about the fuel truck.

[Usas] Are you going to take any concrete actions?

[Purtulis] It is clear the fuel truck has been detained. However, we officially do not know who detained it; customs house officials or the border troops. Importation should be controled by the customs house. However, it seems the customs house does not ban it. So in the end, the tank-lorry has been detained, but who detained it is not known.

At the moment, therefore, we are trying to establish this. When official information about whether or not to ban [passage indistinct] I think everyone understands ordinary customs house officials and ordinary Army soldiers do not solve these problems. Talks between Moscow, Vilnius, and the customs house are in progress; everyone understands that after this fuel truck, more and more would follow. [passage omitted]

Pro-CPSU Party Congress Held in Lithuania

PM0406151990 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 4 Jun 90 Second Edition p 2

[TASS report: "Lithuanian Communist Party (CPSU) in Favor of Socialist Lithuania"]

[Text] Vilnius, 3 Jun—The 21st Congress of the Lithuanian Communist Party (CPSU) continued work here yesterday.

As already reported, following the split in the Lithuanian Communist Party, communists in favor of ideological and organizational unity with the CPSU are holding their forum in three stages. The first stage of the congress was held six weeks ago: It discussed in detail the situation that has developed in the Lithuanian Communist Party and the republic as a whole, mapped out the directions of party organizations' future activity, and elected the party's leading bodies.

The congress sessions resumed with a discussion of the report "On the Drafts of the CPSU Central Committee Platform for the 28th CPSU Congress and the CPSU Statutes," presented to congress delegates by V. Shved, second secretary of the Lithuanian Communist Party (CPSU) Central Committee.

Before setting about defining Lithuanian communists' attitude to the draft documents for the forthcoming 28th CPSU Congress, the speaker dwelt in detail on Lithuania's very acute problems. As he pointed out in his report, the political aspect of the situation is characterized by the continued intensification of confrontation between the republic's Supreme Soviet and the Soviet Union. The degree of this confrontation is not determined by the republic Supreme Soviet's statements on tolerance and a friendly attitude toward the USSR, of which there is no shortage, but by its real actions, the adoption of a whole series of acts which conflict with the USSR Constitution, and the formation of the corresponding state structures. Moreover, the reality of the situation is also that the Communist Party is being squeezed out of all spheres of sociopolitical life. It sometimes reaches the point where communists are direct targets for victimization and persecution.

Attempts are being made in the economic sphere to force the pace of privatizing the republic's national economy, and one can also observe crisis phenomena prompted by the dilettante, adventurist policies of the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet and government, which have set a course of unilaterally severing ties with the Soviet Union.

At the same time there has recently been increased resistance to these policies among various strata of the Lithuanian public. One can also observe a degree of opposition to the republic's current leadership even among members of the Supreme Soviet. However, one should not count on realism prevailing in the policies of the republic's Supreme Soviet and government.

The keynote speaker, and also those who took part in the debate, expressed a unanimous opinion on the question of Lithuanian independence, which is now the greatest cause of concern to the Lithuanian public: The Lithuanian Communist Party (CPSU) is in favor of a socialist Lithuania that is completely autonomous with regard to resolving its own republic's problems, that is independent of any forms of diktat and bureaucratic pressure, and that is a free, voluntary member of the Soviet Federation on the basis of a renewed Union treaty. Considering the level of political, economic, and social culture achieved by the Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic, the Lithuanian Communist Party (CPSU) will speak out in favor of Lithuania being granted special status within the framework of the Soviet Federation for the solution of its political, economic, and social problems, but not at the expense of other Union republics.

Moreover, the Lithuanian Communist Party rejects the unilateral, ultimatum-like declaration of Lithuanian independence proclaimed by the Supreme Soviet 11 March and believes that self-determination for the Lithuanian people must be expressed solely on the basis of a direct expression of their will—in a referendum taking full account of national minorities' interests—and by exercising the right to self-determination within the framework of the USSR Law "On the Procedure for Resolving Questions Connected With the Secession of a Union Republic From the USSR."

Congress delegates were in agreement that both the Lithuanian Communist Party and the CPSU as a whole are in a state of crisis. This is also shown by the fact that Lithuanian communists suffered a substantial defeat in the elections to the Supreme Soviet and local soviets. Preparing for the 28th Party Congress and thinking about their future activity, communists underlined the urgent need to learn lessons for the future. The main lesson must be that pluralism of opinions in the party cannot develop into a conciliatory attitude to those who are opposed to the socialist choice and who are seeking, under the guise of democratization, to cause the party to collapse or to isolate it within a national framework.

It is not only the party's ideological unity but also its organizational unity that is acquiring particular significance today. That is confirmed by the situation in the autonomous Lithuanian Communist Party: Having severed its ties with the CPSU, it has not gained new positions and is, in fact, ceasing to be a political force in the republic.

The 21st Lithuanian Communist Party (CPSU) Congress supported the main provisions of the draft CPSU Central Committee platform for the 28th Party Congress and the draft CPSU statutes and noted their contribution to the creative development of Marxist-Leninist ideas, the democratization of the CPSU, the party's leading role, and unity of action by the country's communists on the basis of the renewed principle of democratic centralism. At the same time, it was admitted that the platform is largely declaratory, fails to fully reveal the mechanism whereby the CPSU will attain the objectives set, lacks in-depth assessments of Soviet society past and present, and fails to analyze mistakes made in the course of perestroyka.

The delegates approved specific proposals to the 28th CPSU Congress made in the report: To provide the opportunity during the congress for delegates to liaise with the party organizations which elected them, even if it is necessary to recess the congress for this purpose; to provide for the holding of an all-party referendum when taking the most important decisions; and to form the CPSU Central Committee Presidium directly at the congress.

The Lithuanian communists' congress approved the Lithuanian Communist Party (CPSU) proposals on the drafts of the discussed documents on the 28th CPSU Congress, adopted resolutions "On the 50th Anniversary of the Restoration of Soviet Power in Lithuania" and "On the Assessment of the Historical Path of the Lithuanian Communist Party," and elected delegates to the 28th CPSU Congress.

The third stage of the Lithuanian Communist Party (CPSU) Congress is scheduled to be held after the conclusion of the 28th CPSU Congress.

Savisaar Letter to Secretary Baker Published

90UN1975B Tallinn MOLODEZH ESTONII in Russian 18 May 90 p 1

[Text] **Mr. James Baker, Secretary of State of the United States, Embassy of the United States of America, Moscow**

Mr. Secretary of State, we notify you that yesterday, 15 May, an attempt was made in Tallinn to impede by force the activity of the Estonian Supreme Soviet pertaining to the peaceful restoration of the independence of the republic of Estonia, which was a direct continuation of USSR President M. Gorbachev's countermanding of the decisions of the Estonian Supreme Soviet the day before. This provocation, geared to the unleashing of violence in Estonia, was cut short by the peaceful and disciplined, but swift and decisive actions of citizens in defense of the parliament and government seeking Estonia's independence. These events have made inevitable the urgent solution of the political crisis, which has reached danger point in the Baltic, at multinational international negotiation level. The main obstacle to such a solution has been the hitherto strictly negative position of the USSR Government and its refusal to recognize the historical right of the peoples of the Baltic to the restoration of their state independence, having curtailed the occupation and annexation on the part of the Soviet Union.

Considering the sharply exacerbated situation in Estonia and Latvia and the unshakable and unconditional aspiration of our people to independence, we, Mr. Secretary of State, would be profoundly amazed were yesterday's events in Estonia and Latvia not to be reflected in your upcoming talks with the USSR leadership.

The demand for the establishment of international supervision in the interests of a peaceful solution of the Baltic crisis has in the current situation become urgent.

[Signed] Edgar Savisaar, chairman of the republic of Estonia government

Law on Provisional Government of Estonia Noted

90UN1975A Tallinn SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA in Russian 18 May 90 p 1

["Law of the Republic of Estonia on the Principles of the Provisional Administrative Procedure of Estonia"]

[Text] Proceeding from the Estonian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] decree of 30 March 1990 "Official Status of Estonia," the republic of Estonia Supreme Soviet resolves:

1. To terminate the subordination of the organs of state power and state administration and the judiciary and procuracy of the Republic of Estonia to the corresponding authorities of the USSR and to detach them from the corresponding system of the USSR.

2. To build relations between the Republic of Estonia and the USSR on the basis of the Tartu Peace Treaty concluded between the Republic of Estonia and the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] on 2 February 1920.

3. That the highest legislative authority in Estonia in the transitional period be exercised by the Republic of Estonia Supreme Soviet, and executive and administrative authority, by the Republic of Estonia Government. The organs of power of the self-governing entities are the corresponding soviets. The Republic of Estonia Supreme Soviet has the right, if necessary, to introduce special conditions in the republic.

4. That all legislative instruments in effect as of the present time on the territory of Estonia continue in force until their revocation or alteration by the Republic of Estonia Supreme Soviet or the Republic of Estonia Government or unless they are contrary to this law or subsequent legislative instruments of the Republic of Estonia.

5. That justice in Estonia be exercised by independent courts of Estonia detached from the judicial authorities of the USSR which in the administration of justice are guided by Article 4 of this law.

Permanent residents of Estonia convicted by Estonian courts serve their sentence on the territory of the Republic of Estonia.

6. That economic disputes between enterprises, establishments, and organizations of the republic be resolved by the State Arbitration Tribunal of the Republic of Estonia.

7. That the prosecutor of the Republic of Estonia be confirmed in office by the Republic of Estonia Supreme Soviet at the proposal of the chairman of the Supreme Soviet.

That prosecutors of districts and cities be appointed to office by the prosecutor of the Republic of Estonia and be approved by the Republic of Estonia Supreme Soviet.

8. That the Republic of Estonia guarantee all residents of the Republic of Estonia social and economic rights, rights in the sphere of culture, and political liberties ensuing from internationally recognized provisions.

That the political rights and liberties of residents of the Republic of Estonia be defined by a separate enactment in accordance with the generally recognized principles of international law.

That the status of USSR servicemen and members of their families in Estonia be determined by agreements concluded between the Republic of Estonia and the USSR.

That guarantees to USSR citizens wishing to move out of Estonia be determined by agreements concluded between the Republic of Estonia and the USSR or the corresponding Union republic or independent state.

9. That the Republic of Estonia guarantee all residents freedom of belief, including the freedom to proclaim their religious beliefs, and the right to study and teach scripture, belong to a church or religious organization, and practice the corresponding rites.

10. That all current state authorities and enterprises, establishments and organizations, and private individuals in the Republic of Estonia be obliged to comply with

the laws and other legislative instruments in effect in Estonia on the basis of this law.

11. That this law take effect as of its enactment.

[Signed] A. Ryuytel, chairman of the Republic of Estonia Supreme Soviet.
16 May 1990, Tallinn

Riga Radio Carries 4 June Latvian Supreme Soviet

Agenda Debated

LD0406085690

[Editorial Report] Riga Domestic Service in Latvian at 0700 GMT on 4 June begins carrying a live relay of the Latvian Supreme Soviet session in Riga.

At 0702 GMT Gorbunov, who is chairing the session, appeals to deputies to take their seats and declares the session open. He announces that 130 deputies are present.

At 0705 GMT Deputy Providenko, speaking in Russian, asks that the session discuss the economic situation in the republic.

Deputies continue arguing over what the session should debate. An unidentified Latvian speaker accuses a Russian-speaking deputy of engaging in demagoguery. Deputies Zatuliviter and Ivanov raise questions about the agenda.

At 0725 GMT Deputies Yagupets and Alksnis express their objections to manifestations of demagoguery.

At 0730 GMT Gorbunov winds up the preceding debate.

At 0733 Ivars Godmanis talks about the work of the government in seeking to formulate a price policy.

At 0738 GMT Deputy Ita Kozakevica talks about the proposed Religious Affairs Commission. The All-Confessions' Meeting on 31 May had agreed that rather than a permanent commission, an All-Confessions' Council at the Supreme Soviet was necessary.

At 0752 GMT it is announced that 150 deputies are present. The agenda is voted on: 118 for, 12 against, and 10 abstentions.

At 0754 GMT a vote is held on including the government's information on the economic situation and price regulation on the agenda. Vote: 105 for, 25 against, and 12 abstentions.

At 0755 GMT discussion begins about ratification of the USSR law on pensions. Deputy Krastins says that the independence declaration should be discussed, not ratification of pensions law.

At 0800 GMT Deputies Belukha and Stroganov, both in speaking Russian, object. Deputy Krumins says that such demagoguery would upset his many Russian electors. They should proceed with work instead. Several more speakers, in Russian, express their support.

At 0809 GMT Gorbunov sums up the points raised, and at 0812 GMT a request is made by 33 deputies for a personal vote on this. It is explained that a print-out of the electronic vote is equivalent to this.

At 0817 GMT Gorbunov moves on to the issue of holidays which is already on the agenda. He suggests the deputies continue with the business on the agenda.

At 0822 GMT Deputy Dinevics, for the majority faction, announces that the faction will not participate in the vote on ratifying USSR law. The republic's law should be discussed instead.

At 0828 GMT it is announced that ballot papers for a personal vote on ratification of the USSR law on pensions are ready.

The session is adjourned for a 30-minute break.

Internal Affairs Minister Elected

LD0406115390

[Editorial Report] Riga Domestic Service in Latvian at 0901 GMT on 4 June resumes its live relay of the Latvian Supreme Soviet session in Riga. At 0903 GMT Godmanis is given the floor and he deals with the question of the Internal Affairs Ministry. He says he has talked with the previously proposed candidate, Viktors Skudra, and explains the circumstances of why this question had not been resolved. The development of the situation had been analyzed. Crime and public order is worsening. The internal affairs situation cannot be dealt with in an isolated manner. The departments concerned should be strengthened.

Godmanis says he had met Bakatin and they discussed the sitaution as seen from the center. In this discussion the most suitable candidate was discussed. Godmanis also discussed this with Skudra, and he proposes as candidate for the minister's position Colonel of Militia Aloizs Vaznis, who is at present working on combating speculation.

At 0914 GMT Vaznis delivers his report giving details of worsening crime, traffic offences, and the fire situation, and of the inadequacy of the present service. He has worked in the service for 33 years, and has never sought high rank. He outlines the pressing problems and ways of dealing with them, especially concerning personnel. He also emphasizes the importance of the militia being subordinated to the government, becoming a militia of the people.

At 0925 GMT Deputy Talavs Jundzis announces that the commission supports the candidacy of Vaznis, and questions him on various internal affairs questions and his personal experience.

At 0952 GMT debate on the candidacy begins with Shapavalov, speaking in Russian, expressing threats of armed conflict, because Steinbriks has said that he would not give up his position without an order from the USSR minister. Deputy Endzins also refers to these threats, as an invitation for anticonstitutional action. At the legislative commission Viktors Alksnis and others had walked out and they could not vote on the candidacy of Vaznis. Deputy Kristovskis supports Vaznis' candidacy, and says Steinbriks cannot remain at the post. Deputy Dimanis complains that his faction was accused of destructiveness. This is not so; they only had doubts, because they had not been told beforehand. He asserts that they could not vote, they needed 20 minutes to discuss this at the faction.

Deputy Jundzis talks about why Steinbriks is not suitable for the position. He explains why Skudra's candidacy was given up. Deputy Krastins talks about the need to solve internal affairs problems, and he also says that it was not right, as Dimanis had said, that the internal affairs ministry is just the militia. The ministry is much more.

At 1019 GMT Gorbunov gives the names of those who still wish to speak, and proposes discontinuing the debate. By a majority of 106 votes in favor, the debate is concluded.

At 1022 GMT Godmanis talks about the militia service and its depoliticization.

At 1033 GMT Deputy Dimanis asks for a 20-minute recess for discussion within the faction. Gorbunov says that he does not have the right to allow this. Gorbunov says that he will apologize if he is mistaken.

At 1036 GMT Deputy Krumins proposes a compromise that the Equal Rights faction be given a 10-minute break for discussion, and at 1039 GMT this is approved by 112 votes in favor.

During this break anchorman Peteris Tabuns explains that the stumbling block was the independence of Latvia, which was unacceptable to the opposition. Aloizs Vaznis would support independence, and this was unacceptable; and he also mentions that Shapavalov, who expressed armed threats, was a militia worker, and that the conduct of Viktors Alksnis went beyond all the norms of behavior.

A musical interlude follows.

At 1051 GMT Gorbunov says that 10 minutes have passed. There has been a request by the necessary number of deputies for a vote by a show of cards.

At 1053 GMT Gorbunov asks for a vote on Vaznis' appointment.

At 1057 GMT the result shows: 114 for, 40 against, and two abstentions. Vaznis' approval is greeted by applause.

Pensions To Be Debated

LD0406130890

[Editorial Report] Riga Domestic Service in Latvian at 1059 GMT on 4 June continues its live relay of the Latvian Supreme Soviet session in Riga.

Gorbunov proposes the remaining procedures for the day. At 1100 GMT it is approved by 105 votes to complete only the agenda in hand, and to conclude the business, as envisaged, after a half-day's sitting.

There follows objections and procedural questions and Dimanis complains about his faction being discriminated against.

From 1109 GMT the votes of the secret and personal ballot on the ratification of USSR law on pensions are read out, and after a few queries, at 1125 GMT the result is as follows: of the 169 deputies present, 52 deputies particpated in the ballot: 48 voted for, two against, and two abstained; and 117 deputies did not take part in the ballot.

At 1127 GMT with 147 votes for, four against, and four abstentions, the issue of pensions is included in the agenda.

At 1128 GMT a proposal is made to convene the plenary sitting on 5 June half-an-hour earlier.

At 1132 GMT a vote on this is conducted with 113 for. The Supreme Soviet will convene tomorrow at 0930 (0630 GMT).

After the Secretariat's and other announcements, during which Juris Dobelis announces that the Secretariat has received documents which support the declaration of independence bearing the signatures of 688,908 people; and documents against the declaration signed by 9,068 people, the sitting adjourned until 5 June.

Proceedings of Latvian Supreme Soviet Reported

LD0106181990 Riga Domestic Service in Latvian 0430 GMT 1 Jun 90

[Text] Yesterday a sitting of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of our republic took place, at which there was an examination of the question of the agenda at next week's sittings.

On Monday the session will examine the question of the appointment of the chairman of the Republic's Committee on Protection of the Environment, on the appointment of the chairman of the Radio and Television Committee of the republic, as well as formulating a draft law on the government of the republic of Latvia. The agenda for Tuesday and Wednesday will also be confirmed.

The Presidium of the Supreme Soviet also examined the structure of the apparatus of the Supreme Soviet, as well as the material provision of the work of the standing commissions of the parliament of the republic. The Presidium of the Supreme Soviet confirmed the chief of the office of the Supreme Soviet, (?Maris Steins), and the administrator of affairs of the Supreme Soviet, (?Zigfrids Brencevs).

Two Die in Latvian Factory Explosion

LD0406202590 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1930 GMT 4 Jun 90

[Text] Here is a report from Jelgava. That is in Latvia. There was a powerful explosion today at an experimental machine factory there. Two people perished. One was brought to the hospital in serious condition. The building was seriously damaged.

Latvian 'Equality' Faction Protests Declaration

90UN1932D Riga SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA in Russian 9 May 90 p 4

[Declaration of the "Equality" deputy faction of the Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet published under the rubric: "First Session of the Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet of the 12th Convocation"]

[Text] Interpreting historical fact and state law arbitrarily and in violation of the USSR Constitution and the Latvian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Constitution, the First Session of the Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet of the 12th Convocation has adopted the Declaration "On the Restoration of the Republic of Latvia's Independence" for examination at the proposal of the NFL [People's Front of Latvia] faction. It provides for the restoration of the 1922 Constitution of bourgeois Latvia and a return to the official name of the state of that period—the Republic of Latvia. It also provides for a change in the state system of the Latvian SSR and in its domestic and foreign political status.

This document is being adopted with a total disregard for the opinions of the deputies representing the interests of a significant part of the republic's population that has uniformly taken a position against such a decision in the course of elections to the Supreme Soviet. Such a decision in fact signifies the secession of the Latvian SSR from the USSR and directly affects the fate of hundreds of thousands of people.

Proceeding from the above, we declare:

1. As the most important issue of the state life of the republic, the question of changing the state system in the Latvian SSR and of changing its domestic and foreign status must be decided in accordance with Article 5 of the Latvian SSR Constitution by way of a referendum (popular vote). The passage of the Declaration "On the Restoration of the Republic of Latvia's Independence" by the Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet is in gross violation of the USSR Constitution and the Latvian SSR Constitution.

2. Because the voters whose interests we represent in the Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet have not authorized us to make anticonstitutional decisions, we do not consider it possible to take part in the voting on this issue and will break off our participation in the work of the session during the time of the voting.

3. We believe that it is necessary to give our constituencies the opportunity to give direct expression to their attitude toward the Declaration "On the Restoration of the Republic of Latvia's Independence," by which our faction will be guided in its further work in the Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet.

In the name of the faction,

[Signed] Chairman S. DIMANIS.
Deputy Chairman V. ALKSNIS.

'Equality' Leader Interviewed

90UN1929E Riga SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA in Russian 8 May 90 p 3

[Interview with Candidate of Economic Sciences Sergey Dimanis, leader of the "Equality" faction of deputies, conducted by SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA parliamentary correspondent E. Lapidus: "'We Did Everything We Could'"]

[Text] [Lapidus] A. Gorbunov, chairman of the republic Supreme Soviet, called your faction a "strong opposition." The press, radio, and television are employing such descriptions as "minority faction" and "federalists," and one foreign radio station styles you as nothing other than "pro-Kremlin deputies." "'Equality' group" is being heard increasingly often now. What do you call yourselves?

[Dimanis] The "Equality" faction of deputies. That would be more correct.

[Lapidus] Inasmuch as there are various figures in the mass media, could you not say how many persons there are in "Equality"?

[Dimanis] As of the morning of 7 May, 58 deputies.

[Lapidus] They represent the interests....

[Dimanis] ...on the order of 600,000 voters, if you are referring to the results of the elections of people's deputies of the republic. We are in fact supported by more than this.

[Lapidus] Let us return to the events of 4 May, which agitated the whole republic. We recall that after V. Bresis' statement on the government's resignation had been read out, I. Godmanis, leader of the Latvian People's Front faction, sought leave to speak and submitted a proposal concerning adoption of the "Declaration on Restoration of the Independence of the Republic of Latvia." Did this come as a surprise to your faction?

[Dimanis] We were expecting this inasmuch as on the morning of 4 May, before the start of the meeting, the deputies had obtained a draft of the declaration. It would be difficult, I believe, to find a precedent in the history of civilized states of a most important document being adopted with such careless, airy haste. This was, after all, not a mass-meeting resolution which was read out and immediately approved by a vote. Essentially the deputies were not given a chance to either think, discuss, or analyze a political document in which every word is important. And references to the fact that what was recorded in the document was well known to everyone do not withstand elementary criticism. It was as if for the deputies of the Latvian People's Front faction neither legal nor parliamentary practice existed, and they manifestly aspire to the laurels of "legislators of fashion" in this respect.

[Lapidus] Sergey Leonidovich, could you not briefly describe the draft declaration?

[Dimanis] Inasmuch as we were not even granted time to check the accuracy of the facts presented in the preamble, the statement and the conclusions, a thorough analysis has yet to be completed. But the first legal nonsense strikes one immediately. According to this draft, the republic Supreme Soviet is illegal and, consequently, does not have the right to adopt any document or law. This is where a string of contradictions, large and small, emanates from. If the draft declaration is taken seriously, a decision should have been made on the self-dissolution of parliament and the holding of new elections. But on the basis of the 1922 Constitution of the Republic of Latvia. In a word, the draft declaration is manifestly contrary to the USSR Constitution.

[Lapidus] How did events develop subsequently?

[Dimanis] Our faction's proposal concerning the creation of a commission to study the draft, as is inherent in the parliamentary practice of civilized countries, was given a hostile reception and, excuse the expression (but it is accurate), was talked down by legal experts of the majority of deputies obedient to the wishes of the Latvian People's Front. The same fate also befell the proposal concerning the holding of a referendum, although it is provided for by the Latvian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Constitution. None of our appeals for common sense met with a response. And if it is considered that a demonstration on the occasion of the adoption of the declaration had been scheduled ahead of time, the hasty, formal discussion, with demagogic appeals—what complaints could there be: The document was examined by the session—and the tactic of arm-twisting of the opposition is understandable. One does not have to be a Solomon in order to say that the whole action had been scripted, with a predetermined outcome.

[Lapidus] What guided the minority faction in its subsequent actions?

[Dimanis] As soon as we learned that the draft document was unconstitutional (and this opinion was unequivocal), computation of the possibilities presented no difficulty. Participation in the voting was not deemed possible since by doing so the faction would essentially have been recognizing the draft. There was no hesitation: It was decided to ignore the vote. True, the idea of a walk-out arose initially, but we subsequently rejected it. The whole faction—58 deputies—remained aloof from the voting.

[Lapidus] Why did "Equality" remain in the meeting room, nonetheless?

[Dimanis] We cannot demand respect for ourselves unless we respect other deputies. Even if they are adopting an unconstitutional document.

[Lapidus] What did you feel when the results of the roll-call vote were announced?

[Dimanis] I had the feeling that the faction had done everything possible. Yes, we were defeated. Yes, we were unable to uphold the interests of our electorate. But we fought to the end, attempting to persuade the majority faction not to rush into the adoption of so important a decision for the fate of the peoples inhabiting the republic. No, outwardly all appeared perfectly democratic. We were called to speak, all the questions we asked were answered and we were heard with understanding, seemingly. Nonetheless, a constant perception was that the deputies of the minority faction were being listened to without being heard and that our efforts were being muffled as if in cotton wool. Then the voting mechanism, which had already been debugged and which put everything in its pre-assigned place, came into effect. There is no blame attaching to "Equality" here. The future, the very near future, what is more, will tell who was right.

[Lapidus] One way or another, 4 May has gone down in history. But what, in your opinion, awaits us tomorrow?

[Dimanis] Making accurate forecasts in politics is a risky and thankless business. However, it may be maintained even now that the adoption of the declaration will obviously result in heavy consequences for all inhabitants of the republic—both for the supporters of the federation and for the supporters of "independence." Even the 138 deputies who unhesitatingly voted "for" can hardly imagine, I believe, the chain of interconnected events which will inevitably ensue from what happened on 4 May. I will express one further thought. The impression is, and not only with me, that a most complex election campaign was conducted exclusively in the name of 4 May. But, after all, life goes on, and other days will follow this date. What will they bring?

[Lapidus] If it is not a secret, what will the faction's tactics be if only in the next few days?

[Dimanis] The choice is not a rich one. We have two options. First, we participate in parliament's law-making activity, watching to see that the laws which are enacted are not contrary to logic, do not violate human rights, and do not destroy the already exhausted economy. The second option is that the "Equality" faction refuses to study and discuss bills contrary to the constitution of the republic and the USSR. A final choice has not yet been made.

[Lapidus] Your attitude toward the decision of the United Council of Labor Collectives Presidium, according to which, in the event of the adoption of an unlawful decree on a change in the official status of the republic, a political strike would be declared as of 15 May?

[Dimanis] The "Equality" faction engages in purely parliamentary work and does not accept nonparliamentary forms of struggle. If, however, the law-making of deputies representing the interests of the Latvian People's Front causes discontent in a broad strata of the population, we will try to reduce the negative consequences of the confrontation to a minimum.

At the same time I would like to add that the wordiness of the declaration has not concealed its foundations—a breach of constitutional provisions and the start of a severance of the republic's official ties to the USSR. One further point. There is no third way toward independence, about which so much has been said. The contours of the Lithuanian version have already emerged. And everyone already has a good idea of what this means. For this reason, according to a TASS communication, Moscow's reaction will be identical also: In the event of the republic's disregard for the USSR Constitution, President M. Gorbachev reserves the right to adopt retaliatory measures of a political, economic, and administrative nature.

Also highly indicative, in my view, is the following fact. An "Equality" deputy submitted at the session the proposal that the majority faction assume responsibility for the consequences of the adoption of the declaration. But this proposal, like many others, incidentally, was simply ignored.

[Lapidus] Thank you for the interview.

Latvian Labor Collectives Oppose Declaration

90UN1932E Riga SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA in Russian 9 May 90 p 4

[Declaration by the Associated Council of Labor Collectives of the Latvian SSR: "To the Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet"]

[Text] On 4 May 1990 the Latvian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet, contrary to the will of numerous work collectives, without conducting a national referendum, and without taking into account the opinion of a significant portion of the deputies, passed the Declaration "On the Restoration of the Republic of Latvia's Independence," declaring a return to the bourgeois Constitution and virtual secession from the USSR.

The passage of the Declaration completely disregarded Article 72 of the Union Constitution and the USSR Law "On a Procedure for Deciding Issues Relating to the Secession of a Union Republic From the USSR," as well as Articles 107 and 108 of the Latvian SSR Constitution which establish examination of such draft bills only in the event that all the deputies attending the session of the Supreme Soviet vote in favor of it and only after a preliminary discussion in the appropriate standing committees.

The discussion of the Declaration took place in undemocratic circumstances: The deputies were familiarized with the draft only before the beginning of the session; there was no provision for discussion of its rules; and not everyone expressed his opinion who wished to, there was psychological pressure put on the deputies who did not agree with proposals in the Declaration, their speeches were interrupted, and sometimes the floor was taken from them.

Having resolved to restore the Republic of Latvia Constitution adopted by the Constituent Assembly on 15 February 1922, the Supreme Soviet did not even find time to present it to the deputies, never mind conducting a discussion on the introduction of the amendments and supplements that were necessary if only because of the antiquity of its adoption, almost seventy years in the past.

The Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet, having set the constitutional norms and restored the Republic of Latvia Constitution, has committed an anti-Soviet and anticonstitutional coup by this act.

The responsibility before history and the people for all the possible consequences which such decisions may entail lies with the authors and inspirers of those 138 deputies who voted for them.

The Latvian SSR Associated Council of Labor Collectives lodges a strong protest against the anticonstitutional actions of the republic's higher state organ and affirms that the Constitution, laws, decrees, and other acts of the Republic of Latvia which have already come into force and those which will be adopted prior to the restoration of the Latvian SSR do not have legal force and are not to be carried out inasmuch as they contradict Article 74 of the USSR Constitution and the Union Law on limiting the powers between the USSR and subjects of the federation.

The illegal actions of the Supreme Soviet may cost the republic's inhabitants dearly. Recognizing this, the representatives of the labor collectives and social organizations of the City of Riga advanced a proposal on 4 May to conduct a political strike. They were supported by workers in the other cities of the republic.

Taking into consideration the will of the labor collectives and acknowledging the need to restore Soviet power in Latvia, the Latvian SSR Associated Council of Labor Collectives is appealing to all the republic's labor collectives to begin preparations for a political strike and to demand that the decisions of the Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet session of 4 May 1990, which are directed at the overthrow of Soviet power in Latvia and Latvia's secession from the Soviet Union, be changed.

We require that at the current session the republic's state organs present and adopt a draft law guaranteeing maintenance of the standard of living, employment, and full social protection for the residents of the Latvian SSR.

In the event that our demands are not met, we reserve the right to form our own Soviet organs of power.

[Signed] The Latvian SSR Associated Council of Labor Collectives.

Rubiks Opposes Independence Declaration

90UN1932A Riga SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA in Russian 9 May 90 p 3

[LETA report of speech by Deputy A. Rubiks to the First Session of the 12th Convocation of the Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet: "Discussion of the Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet Draft Declaration 'On the Restoration of the Republic of Latvia's Independence'"]

[Text] Today a document has been proposed for examination by the Supreme Soviet which will stand the whole life of the republic, the fate of the people, and the fate of each family and each person on its head. What is proposed is nothing more or less than the restoration of the social order of bourgeois Latvia. It is to restore the 1922 Satversme (Constitution) and functionally break state ties between the Latvian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] and the Soviet Union. The communist deputies can only evaluate this document in a negative fashion.

In order to ground the need for such radical changes in our republic on "theory," the authors of the draft document offer a distorted political and legal interpretation of the historical events in Latvia over the last 72 years. Yes, in 1918 a Latvian bourgeois state really was proclaimed, but in November 1917 a Soviet Latvia was created on unoccupied territory of Latvia—the republic of Iskolata, which became the first state formation of the Latvian people. It was this state which had its continuation on 17 December 1918, when the Latvian SSR was founded. Therefore the Soviet roots of power existing on Latvian soil are deeper than any other state formation. Thousands of Latvian revolutionaries fought and gave their lives for Soviet power in Latvia, and thousands of those for whom revolutionary ideals are dear are prepared to fight today. As for the 1922 Constitution, which is supposedly "de jure" valid today, this is an absurd, legally unfounded fiction. Anyone who knows history at all knows about the thirties in Latvia. We need to recall that after the 15 May 1934 coup, Karlis Ulmanis dissolved the Seim, arrested 31 of its deputies, repealed the Constitution, closed down all the parties with his laws, and eliminated self-management at all levels. In a word, how could there be talk of a Satversme in 1934, in 1940, and today?

In my opinion the Supreme Soviet has taken too great a burden upon itself today in trying, illegally and without any foundation, to return to the Satversme, having taking four paragraphs from it and for the time being repealed the rest. Why do I say this? In the first place there is no legal basis for qualifying the USSR Government's note and the introduction of units of the Red Army into Latvia on 17 June 1940 as an international crime, as the draft document states. Because the government of Karlis Ulmanis agreed to the demands expressed by the note, which effectively saved Latvia from the very real threat of attack by Hitler. In the second place, the assertion that the elections of 14 and 15 July 1940 took place in an atmosphere of terror and that the results of the elections were falsified is unfounded. These assertions are based only on agitated emotions. In the third place, the Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet does not have the right to repeal a ruling of the Seim because they have equal rights. Rulings of the People's Seim express the will of the laborers of Latvia and, first and foremost, the aspirations of the Latvian working people. In the fourth place, the authoritarian regime of Karlis Ulmanis itself was anticonstitutional and was liquidated by the rulings of the People's Seim. In the fifth place, the Soviet forces who perished as a result of the Great Patriotic War, the battles of the Latvian Rifle Corps and the partisan brigades, and the broad struggle of the antifascist underground against the Nazi occupiers and their allies are all clear evidence of the legality of Soviet power in Latvia.

These are the facts. But will we raise our hands, vote for this document, and then stand and applaud for a long time? But at that moment we should think about the people who are now watching on television and listening on the radio. The many hundreds of living Red riflemen, who fought for Soviet power in the days of the October Revolution and in the civil war—what are they feeling today? Those who did time in the jails of bourgeois Latvia and worked in the Kalntsiyemskiy stone quarry—what are they going to do? The relatives of those 156,000 who perished for the freedom of Soviet Latvia in the years of the Great Patriotic War and whose fathers and sons, husbands and wives lie in fraternal graves in the Latvian earth—what will they feel? The hundreds of thousands of workers, construction people, and transport workers for whom we are today preparing imminent unemployment—how do they see their future?

Yes, the Latvian Communist Party acknowledges nations the right to self-determination and supports the right of each people to create its own independent state and secede from the Soviet Union. But independence without specific and completely real political, economic, and international status is a fiction which can only bring unhappiness and poverty. The decision, made without a clear idea of its possible consequences, may completely collapse the economy, which is already in a critical situation. They say that the USSR will still be very interested in continuing economic ties with Latvia even when there is a new social system here. However we forget that for two years our mass media have continually been cultivating in the social consciousness the thought that the USSR is our mortal enemy and has been constantly casting the USSR in the role of the enemy. Should we not expect the same reaction from the other side, which has at its command one hundred times the forces? Will we not complain of a lack of raw materials, of a shortage of that energy which we now receive for almost nothing, and of many other things which will irretrievably disappear from our daily routine? We toss about the words "private property" and "denationalization" so frivolously. Do we know how many shares of our factories, homes and land will end up in the safes of Western bankers? I am troubled, very troubled, that there is much in this decision which has not been revealed and thought through...

In the name of the members of the Latvian Communist Party and in the name of all those residents of Latvia who do not accept the attempt of the deputies of the People's Front to force upon Latvia an anticonstitutional Declaration of Independence whose political and social consequences may not be foreseen today and threaten the peace and stability not only of the western USSR but of all of northern Europe, I declare that the mandates of deputy which were contested in the election campaign were not granted in order to change the political system but rather to defend the interests of the people and their welfare.

Expressing the will of my constituency, I declare that I am empowered to express in the most forceful terms what thousands of industrial workers think about events. Our constituencies declare that they do not accept and do not support a Declaration of Independence which is not based on the real practice of perestroyka and on the will of all the residents of Latvia as expressed in a referendum. Our constituencies declare that they will take real action against laws and declarations forced on them by the Supreme Soviet. This opposition will express itself in mass demonstrations of protest and picketing, in political protest strikes in all the cities of Latvia, and in the request that the president of the state protect their interests.

As deputies we must hear all these thoughts which have been expressed by representatives of the workers and we must take responsibility for all the consequences if we do not pay attention to the voice of the people.

I conclude. So that we do not commit our next mistake and make a decision which is not backed by all the people, I see only one possibility—put this question to a referendum and act as the existing laws demand. Laws have been passed limiting the authority of the USSR and the subjects of the federation and setting the procedure for seceding from the USSR. We should be guided by them. That is, if we really are for democracy and for deciding all issues as a rule-of-law state is supposed to. In my opinion, the assertions of some deputies that a national discussion has already taken place are unfounded. Perhaps someone will be found in the audience who could say where the minutes are, how many people took part in the discussion, and what were the points of view that they shared. Without having heard the voice of the people we are not authorized to decide a question that is so important and make a decision that is so important.

Latvian Government Appointments Published

90UN1932C Riga SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA in Russian 9 May 90 p 4

[Decrees published under the rubric: "First Session of the Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet of the 12th Convocation"]

[Text] **Decree of the Latvian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet on the Election of Deputy D.E. Ivans as First Deputy Chairman of the Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet**

The Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet decrees:

To elect Deputy Daynis Evaldovich Ivans first deputy chairman of the Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet.

[Signed] A. GORBUNOV, chairman of the Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet.
I. DAUDISH, secretary of the Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet.
Riga, 3 May 1990.

Decree of the Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet on the Election of Deputy A.V. Krastinsh as Deputy Chairman of the Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet

The Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet decrees:

To elect Deputy Andrey Viktorovich Krastinsh deputy chairman of the Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet.

[Signed] A. GORBUNOV, chairman of the Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet.
I. DAUDISH, secretary of the Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet.
Riga, 3 May 1990.

Decree of the Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet on the Election of Deputy I.A. Daudish as Secretary of the Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet

The Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet decrees:

To elect Deputy Imant Antonovich Daudish secretary of the Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet.

[Signed] A. GORBUNOV, chairman of the Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet.
Riga, 3 May 1990.

Decree of the Supreme Soviet of the Republic of Latvia on the Appointment of a Chairman of the Republic of Latvia Council of Ministers

The Republic of Latvia Supreme Soviet decrees:

1. To appoint Ivar Teodorovich Godmanis chairman of the Republic of Latvia Council of Ministers.

2. To commission I.T. Godmanis, chairman of the Republic of Latvia Council of Ministers, with presenting to the Republic of Latvia Supreme Soviet a proposal concerning the staffing of the Government of the Republic of Latvia.

[Signed] A. GORBUNOV, chairman of the Republic of Latvia Supreme Soviet.

I. DAUDISH, secretary of the Republic of Latvia Supreme Soviet.

Riga, 7 May 1990.

I. Godmanis

Ivar Godmanis is a Latvian and was born in 1951 in Riga. He is the father of two children. He has a higher education. He is a candidate of physical-mathematical sciences. He worked at the University of Latvia as a senior instructor. Since 1974 he has simultaneously occupied himself with scientific work.

He began his activity in the People's Front of Latvia [NFL] as a lecturer on the Political Committee, and then he headed that committee.

At the Second NFL Congress in October 1989 he was elected deputy chairman of the NFL.

He was elected people's deputy of the Republic of Latvia from the 139th Kuldigskiy Electoral District on 18 March 1990. He is chairman of the NFL faction of the Latvian Supreme Soviet.

Decree of the Supreme Soviet of the Republic of Latvia on the Appointment of a First Deputy Chairman of the Republic of Latvia Council of Ministers

The Republic of Latvia Supreme Soviet decrees:

1. To appoint Ilmar Olgertovich Bisher first deputy chairman of the Republic of Latvia Council of Ministers.

[Signed] A. GORBUNOV, chairman of the Republic of Latvia Supreme Soviet.

I. DAUDISH, secretary of the Republic of Latvia Supreme Soviet.

Riga, 7 May 1990.

RSFSR

RSFSR Congress Resumes Session 5 June

LD0506084990 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0630 GMT 5 Jun 90

[Excerpts] At the Congress of People's Deputies of Russia. We are now going over to the all-Union radio correspondent in the Grand Kremlin Palace. At the microphone is Olga Vasilenko:

[Vasilenko] Today began with the traditional procedure of saluting the flag of the Russian Federation. Then fifteen minutes were spent on speeches dealing with the agenda and the procedure. The first to take the rostrum today was Deputy Nelasov from Naberezhnyye Chelnyy, who announced that he had information to the effect that certain lists are circulating behind the scenes and certain groups of deputies are perusing them. These lists contain the names of people against whom they should vote when the Supreme Soviet is being formed. The deputy announced that he has been in the ranks of the CPSU for 22 years, does not belong to any bloc or grouping, and nothing but his conscience can put pressure on him. But he said he is worried about the future of the congress since, in his view, what is going on now is not a political game but a political struggle, and some deputies want to retain the principle of democratic centralism in the sense that the decisions of superior bodies are binding on lower bodies. But it is conscience alone that should decide everything. [passage omitted]

Deputy Astafyev put forward the thought that the congress is on the verge of stalemate. This morning, he said, he had been on the balcony and had seen an assembly of deputies. Deputies Tsoy and Nazarchuk appeared to be urging all the participants in this assembly to disrupt the voting today and force the chairman to name the candidates he wants.

That, then, is the very complicated situation at the congress today. But then, after all these speeches, Supreme Soviet Chairman Yeltsin said that, after deep thought, he had a proposal that Khasbulatov, as an economist and scholar, is needed by the Supreme Soviet today and so his candidacy should be put to the vote; but as for the candidacy of Shakhray as deputy chairman, there is perhaps no need to put the candidacy of deputy chairman to the vote. Instead, it could be postponed to the end of the congress and thus the congress could move on. Well, the decision has been taken to have the voting at 1200. The work of the congress is continuing.

Moscow TV Relays 4 June Congress Proceedings

Khasbulatov Outlines Program

LD0406170190

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1431 GMT on 4 June broadcasts a recorded relay of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic

[RSFSR] Congress of People's Deputies session in Moscow on 4 June. Yeltsin opens the session. He says that they have received an approximate schedule of the work for the week. The cadres issues are not finished. A conciliatory commission discussed the candidatures of deputy chairmen. The first issue today is the election of the first deputy chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet. Each candidate will be given 10 minutes to present his program. Questions and 20 minutes for debate will follow.

At 1438 GMT registration takes place: 864 are present, more than enough for a quorum.

At 1440 GMT Zaytsev presents suggestions for forming a working group to prepare for Supreme Soviet formation. His suggestions are adopted by vote.

At 1442 GMT Deputy Lebedev from Gorno-Altay speaks on the inadequacies of the electronic voting system for secret ballots.

At 1445 GMT Yeltsin asks for a vote on the question of a commission on electronic voting. It is adopted by vote.

At 1447 GMT Yeltsin says they will go on to debate the candidature for the first deputy chairman of the Supreme Soviet. Yeltsin proposes Khasbulatov as the sole candidate.

At 1449 GMT Magomedov speaks on Friday's debates. Abdulatipov should be a candidate, he says.

At 1452 GMT Yeltsin says Abdulatipov has already failed to be elected twice. Yeltsin asks Khasbulatov to present his program.

At 1455 GMT Khasbulatov presents his program. He gives some biographical details. He speaks of the need for economic sovereignty; of the difficulties in the lives of the people of Groznyy; of the hardship of price increases for the poor; of the question of the market causing unemployment. How can one adopt such an economic model? The market should ensure equal opportunity for all ethnic groups.

At 1505 GMT Yeltson gives the deputies 15 minutes for questions and answers. Khasbulatov expands on economic issues. He speaks in favor of privatization. On the nationalities issue, he says everyone must obey their Constitution. Problems have roots going far back. Private property cannot be panacea for all our ills. A mixed economy will improve matters he says, and speaks for the regulating role of the state to improve the economy. On Yeltsin's statement on relations with Baltic states, he denies that it contravenes the USSR Congress decision.

At 1522 GMT the debates continue. Deputy Fedorov from Sakhalin, Deputy Mumuyev from Checheno-Ingushetia, and Deputy Akhmetov from Kabardino-Balkaria speak in favor of Khasbulatov's candidature.

At 1535 GMT Deputy Bystrov speaks on behalf of the agrarians, and wants Abdulatipov.

At 1536 GMT Deputy Beloglazov from Bashkiria speaks in support of Khasbulatov.

At 1538 GMT Yeltsin says the 20 minutes for debate are up.

At 1539 GMT Deputy Golovin speaks about the electronic secret ballot.

At 1542 GMT Yeltsin asks if the electronic secret ballot contravenes the standing orders. Deputy Sayenko explains the legal aspect, and says that the congress has already decided against trusting the machine in important matters.

At 1544 GMT the deputies vote in favor of a normal secret ballot, using booths.

AT 1546 GMT the candidate for deputy chairman, Shakhray, is invited to speak. He speaks on the apparatus of the Supreme Soviet of the RSFSR, which he considers inadequate for normal work and parliamentary relations with other republics.

At 1554 GMT Yeltsin announces 15 minutes for questions. Shakhray answers questions about his qualifications and ideas.

At 1600 GMT the recorded relay breaks for 15 minutes.

Coverage Debated

LD0406183990

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1615 GMT on 4 June resumes broadcasting a recorded relay of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic (RSFSR) Congress of People's Deputies session in Moscow on 4 June. Shakhray is still replying to questions: about the administration of autonomous republics; about the expansion of the Supreme Soviet apparatus—it will give the taxpayer a better value for his money; and about lack of experience in production work—he will work in a factory if that helps. A deputy says Shakhray should not be a candidate after his previous failure to be elected, and quotes the standing orders; Shakhray says his nomination is within the rights of the chairman. Asked about relations between Russia and the USSR, Shakhray says constructive dialogue is needed; he expects to see such a dialogue between Gorbachev and Yeltsin.

At 1626 GMT the debate on Shakhray's candidacy begins. Deputy Ivanov says that according to the results of previous votes, surely Yarov should be the candidate, not Shakhray. He asks for Yarov to be put up as a alternative, on behalf of Leningrad deputies.

At 1629 GMT Deputy Mikhaylov from Chuvashia speaks in favor of Shakhray. His youth is a good thing. Yeltsin refuses to give a deputy the floor as he wants to talk about an alternative candidate, and not about Shakhray. Deputy Dmitriyev says Ivanov was not speaking on behalf of all Leningrad deputies.

At 1633 GMT Deputy Mozgo condemns discrimination against young people, and speaks in Shakhray's favor. Deputy Gasparyan speaks of the need to return power to local soviets and about the political grouping of deputies; he appeals for a solid vote for the candidate, as he is the result of compromise.

At 1640 GMT Deputy Plotnikov says younger people have more brain cells and fresher ideas. He knows no better candidate from the Democratic Russia group than Shakhray, who is from the communists of Russia group. Yeltsin asks the deputies to refrain from sniping at each other's groups.

At 1644 GMT Deputy Maley speaks in praise of Shakhray's promise to look after autonomous formations, and in favor of a young deputy chairman. Shakhray is a moderate, he says. He could help produce a good Supreme Soviet apparatus.

At 1647 GMT Yeltsin says the debate time is up, and declares 30-minute break.

At 1648 GMT the recorded relay of the afternoon session of the RSFSR Congress of People's Deputies begins.

At 1650 GMT Deputy Nikitin speaks from the rostrum about the lack of progress in the congress. It could affect farm work, he says, and suggests stopping broadcasting the congress until more results are achieved, along with a brisker conduct of business. He asks for a time limit on the remaining points on the agenda. He notes the cost of the congress, and suggests a Saturday session. Too many deputies are absent from the hall, he says.

At 1653 GMT, at Yeltsin's request, deputies stand to honor the memory of the victims of the Bashkir rail disaster. Concerning broadcasting, Yeltsin says some deputies feel it is distracting. He asks if the deputies want a vote—they do. An unidentified deputy speaks from the rostrum in favor of more businesslike working, and supports an end to broadcasting. Deputy (?Khromchenkov) says he talks to his constituents regularly, and they would be offended if they could not see their deputies at work. Another deputy supports him; he doesn't want it to seem that they are returning to the old ways of deciding things behind the people's back. Deputy Kadminskiy says broadcasting should continue.

At 1701 GMT a deputy from Severodvinsk speaks in favor of a full relay of the congress and voting by name.

At 1702 GMT Deputy Konstantinov says the question of relaying the proceedings has already been discussed, so why are we wasting time on it now?

At 1703 GMT Deputy Boronenko says he is for "full glasnost" and the proceedings should be covered in full.

At 1704 GMT Deputy Gurevich from Murmansk also speaks in favor of a full transmission of the proceedings.

At 1706 GMT an unidentified deputy makes a point about the coverage of the congress by local stations, noting the fact that SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA carries a full stenographic account of the proceedings.

Work Schedule Debated

LD0406192990

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1707 GMT on 4 June continues broadcasting a recorded relay of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic Congress of People's Deputies session in Moscow on 4 June. Deputy (?Sysoyev) proposes that small groups be set up to discuss matters raised today, make decisions, and report back to the congress; says a commission should be set up to look into the republican budget; makes further points about marketing and the situation of Russian-speaking population in Union republics.

At 1710 GMT Deputy Slobodkin from Moscow Oblast speaks on behalf of the Popular Unity movement, and says full coverage of the proceedings should continue.

At 1711 GMT Yeltsin calls for a vote on whether voting should be carried out by name: 639 are for, 216 against, and seven abstentions. It is carried.

At 1713 GMT Yeltsin asks for a vote on the question of continuation of full coverage of the congress proceedings: 890 for, 42 against, and seven abstentions. It is carried. Yeltsin reiterates that this matter has been voted on before, and there can be no doubt that deputies want to continue in this vein.

At 1716 GMT Yeltsin says there is a proposal that proceedings continue until 1900, and on Saturday, too. Various deputies make points on the schedule for the daily proceedings.

At 1718 GMT Deputy Shustov calls for two days a week to be devoted to working in groups, and then report back with specific decisions.

At 1719 GMT an unidentified deputy sees no need to work differently from the standing orders.

At 1720 GMT Deputy Kharitonov says that the working day should start at 0930, and the main thing is that the work be constructive. Two more deputies make points on the schedule and coverage of proceedings.

At 1723 GMT Yeltsin wants to put the question of working on Saturday to the vote. The vote on whether voting should be by name: 597 for, 275 against, 18 abstain. It is carried. Vote on whether Saturday should be a working day: 889 for, 29 against, 11 abstain. It is carried.

At 1727 GMT, on the question of daily work schedule, Yeltsin says he has met with different groups, and the feeling is that six hours is enough. The working day should be from 1000-1800, including breaks. There has been a proposal to work from 1000-1900. He calls for voting by name on this proposal: 870 for, 56 against four abstain. It is carried.

At 1731 GMT Yeltsin asks the deputies whether they think separate working groups should be set up on individual problems, and puts this to the vote: 126 for, 740 against, 31 abstain: not carried. The commissions and committees will continue to work as before, only work more strictly according to the agenda.

At 1734 GMT Yeltsin calls on (?Yachugin), of the Editorial Commission, to speak about Article 20 on standing orders, on which there is some confusion. He calls for a vote on whether Article 20 should remain on its original form, with a minor change in wording: 593 for, 261 against, 32 abstain: carried.

At 1739 GMT a member of the secretariat makes a few points about inquiries and notes received from deputies on various matters.

At 1741 GMT Yeltsin says an appeal was made yesterday by Yakut drivers: Does anyone want to speak about this?

AT 1742 GMT a representative of the Kuzbass Drivers' Union says his committee has met, and considers that the Yakut drivers' dismissal for striking in July 1989 was unjustified. Yeltsin suggests that the procuracy be required to investigate, and report to the congress. Various announcements and points of order are made while deputies vote on the proposal. Deputy Domina thinks a deputies' commission should be formed on the drivers' dispute; Yeltsin says they can see about this after the procuracy reports. Deputy Volkov notes that many people complain that the procuracy does not look after workers' rights properly. An unidentified deputy reads an appeal from Muslims concerning trips to Mecca. The vote on Yeltsin's proposal on a procuracy investigation is not shown.

At 1757 GMT an unidentified deputy calls for a time limit of a week on the procuracy report. Deputy Glotov refers to the draft declaration of Russian sovereignty, to be discussed on 6 June, and announces a meeting in connection with it. Yeltsin says all suggestions should be submitted to the commission. Other meetings of groups are announced.

At 1804 GMT an unidentified deputy reads a message to the congress from legal workers concerning the rising crime rate in the RSFSR. The fight against crime has been poorly organized in the years of perestroyka. A list of measures is needed.

At 1809 GMT the chairman of the tellers' commission says that all is now ready for the vote. Voting should take half an hour, and the result will be ready at 1600. A break is declared.

Health Care Viewed

LD0406210490

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1810 GMT on 4 June continues broadcasting a recorded relay of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic Congress of People's Deputies session in Moscow on 4 June.

A feature entitled "Our Parliamentary Correspondents Report" is broadcast: interviews with deputies in the foyer are carried. Deputy Gulko talks about the way deputy chairmen are being elected. He says there should be alternatives for the sake of democracy.

At 1813 GMT Deputy Zerin talks to the correspondent, saying that the nomination of candidates has been in accordance with the Constitution.

At 1815 GMT Deputy Peruanskiy is asked if Yeltsin is matching up to people's expectations of him. He says Yeltsin is acting in a very democratic fashion. Too democratic, in fact, when he fails to cut off a deputy speaking off the point. On nominations for deputy chairmen, Yeltsin has done what he can, within the Constitution, to complete the election.

At 1813 GMT a correspondent chats with Deputy Shakhray about himself. Shakhray says that although he is relatively young, he has experience in practical work. Politically, he is in the center, he says.

At 1821 GMT Deputy Mikitayev is interviewed about the interests of autonomous areas. They need sovereignty of their own, as part of the Federation, he says.

At 1824 GMT the television announcer says that the report on the congress session will resume shortly. A musical interlude ensues.

At 1855 GMT the recorded relay resumes, with the evening session of the RSFSR Congress of People's Deputies.

At 1856 GMT Sidorenko, chairman of the tellers' commission, is given the floor to report on the elections for first deputy chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet. Of 902 votes cast, 459 are for Khasbulatov, and 443 are against. Khasbulatov is thus not elected. The report is endorsed by the deputies with 843 for, 31 against, and one abstention.

At 1900 GMT Sidorenko reports on elections for deputy chairman. Of 901 votes cast, 431 are for Shakhray, and 470 are against. The report is endorsed by the deputies with 840 for, 40 against, and seven abstentions.

At 1903 GMT Yeltsin says Boris Mikhaylovich (Isayev) will chair the session for "any other business"; Yeltsin is taking a "time-out."

At 1904 GMT Deputy Ryabov from Leningrad says that not enough attention is paid to health matters at the congress. Neglect of health care for the people amounts to genocide. More money must be put into the health service, he says.

At 1907 GMT Grachev, of the Secretariat, deals with some correspondence about local soviet elections, and a few administrative matters.

At 1909 GMT Deputy Doyev passes on the government reply to deputies' questions about the numbers of refugees from the Armenian-Azerbaijan dispute.

At 1912 GMT Deputy Tolstoy reports on the progress of his commission's work on a draft declaration of sovereignty. Deputies have had plenty of opportunity to examine the drafts. Proposals will be summed up tomorrow. Also tomorrow, he says, the draft "Decree on Power" will be distributed. Documents being prepared in the commission are suffering from the same split that is evident in the work of the congress; thus different versions will be offered on Wednesday.

At 1916 GMT Deputy Bystrov says his constituents think the congress will never get down to practical work. They would like to see a decision establishing equal prices for the town and the country. Bystrov asks for the congress to stick to the agenda, and not spend time on side issues or on debating the draft economic reform.

At 1919 GMT a deputy from Irkutsk talks about the problems of people working at the Baykalsk pulp and paper combine, which, it is proposed, might be closed down. The government should help with tax concessions and planning for alternative employment.

At 1923 GMT Deputy Vorokin from Rybinsk says he is disappointed with the voting. Factional interests are spoiling the work of the congress. A referendum should be held on whether to dissolve the congress and have fresh elections, Vorokin says.

At 1930 GMT Isayev reads out a proposal for starting to discuss right away the composition of the Supreme Soviet. A conciliation commission will be working on proposals from tomorrow morning, he says.

At 1931 GMT Deputy Revakin from Altay speaks about the voting on deputy chairmen. He does not understand why the congress is so distracted by territorial and factional interests.

Candidates Debated

LD0406212190

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1933 GMT on 4 June continues broadcasting a recorded relay of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic Congress of People's Deputies session in Moscow on 4 June. Deputy Bereznikov from Kursk says something mus be done about the refugee problem.

At 1935 GMT Deputy Rzhanikov from Leningrad speaks about a mix-up in the list of people wishing to serve in committees.

At 1936 GMT Deupty (?Glotov), in uniform, speaks about a press article by Volkogonov, which he thinks is an offence to people's deputies.

At 1940 GMT a deputy says that attempts to find deputy chairmen are at a dead end, and suggests postponing appointments. Another deputy complains about unsuitability of the hall for the congress's work, and the lines for the microphone; and says deputies who failed to vote should have their names published.

At 1942 GMT Deputy Borisenko reads the declaration of a group of deputies calling for formation of proper parliamentary parties, which other deputies are free to put their names to.

At 1946 GMT Grachev, head of the Secretariat, says it has received requests from deputies regarding the wages and housing conditions for deputies and their families, and in which commissions and committees this should be discussed and when; he also discusses the standing orders.

At 1950 GMT Yeltsin reads out the names of deputies proposed for the commission for the preparation of the standing orders, and asks for this to be voted on. The voting is: 670 for, 119 against, and seven abstentions.

At 1952 GMT various deputies make points regarding a proposal by Yeltsin to give Khasbulatov and Shakhray executive powers. They disagree with this proposal. And other deputy speaks on behalf of the Democratic Center, calling for more productive work from the congress and asking for the conciliation committee to continue its work.

At 2000 GMT Yeltsin explains in more detail his proposal regarding Khasbulatov and Shakhray. He once again puts their names forward, and calls for a vote to be taken on this tomorrow morning. Tomorrow they will go on to discuss the formation of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet.

At 2006 GMT an unidentified deputy believes that Yarov and Abdulatipov should also be included in the vote. Deputy Slivchenko makes a number of points regarding these candidacies, and also proposes that Yarov and Abdulatipov be included. Various deputies complain about the way in which deputies are going about proceedings and about the time they are wasting. Deputy Gurevich believes deputies are showing inconsistency in their behavior.

At 2020 GMT Deputy Samoylin supports Yeltsin's proposal regarding the vote on the two candidates.

At 2022 GMT Yeltsin says that anyone who is absent from the congress for any reason should explain why.

At 2024 GMT Deputy Sokolov from Leningrad says he cannot understand why Yarov should not be a candidate. He and Abdulatipov should be on the voting slips.

At 2027 GMT a young deputy from Kuzbass asks for support for Shakhray, and thus also for Yeltsin.

At 2029 GMT Deputy Rumyantsev says the conciliation commission tried to ensure a coalition basis in nominations. He suggests that if Yeltsin's nominations are again rejected, the congress should adjourn for a week for deputies to consult with voters. A deadlock in forming the Supreme Soviet must be avoided.

At 2032 GMT Deputy Bogachev suggests various options for candidates. Deputy Klyuyev suggests leaving the election until later. Deputy Salnikov says it is time to forget this talk of coalitions and groups; Shakhray and Khasbulatov should withdraw their candidacies.

At 2034 GMT a deputy from Kamchatka suggests that the congress should have split into those who voted for Yeltsin and those who voted against, and each put forward their own candidates for all the posts.

At 2036 GMT, prior to closing the session, Yeltsin asks the deputies to stand in memory of the victims of the Arzamas explosives disaster.

At 2037 GMT one more deputy wants to speak; he says it is time to stop playing games. The question will not be settled until Abdulatipov becomes a candidate. He is young and a political moderate.

At 2038 GMT Yeltsin declares the session closed.

Leadership Candidates Address RSFSR Congress

LD0406122690 Moscow TASS in English 1129 GMT 4 Jun 90

[By TASS parliamentary correspondents Lev Akensov, Kirill Dibrova, and Dmitriy Polunin]

[Text] Moscow June 4 TASS—Russian Supreme Soviet President Boris Yeltsin nominated new candidates for his first vice-president and vice-president at the morning session of the Russian Federation Congress of People's Deputies today.

Using his constitutional right, he decided against holding multi-candidate elections, suggesting one candidate for each post.

Ruslan Khasbulatov, Yeltsin's choice for first vice-president from the Chechen-Ingush Autonomous Republic, spoke in detail about his programme for a transition to a market economy.

Sergey Shakhrai, a lawyer from Moscow, is Yeltsin's choice for vice-president. Shakhrai was nominated for the post during the first congressional vote last week. He won fewer votes than his opponent. This and his age—at 34 he is among the youngest at the congress—produced a mixed reaction among the deputies. Some deputies wondered if he was old enough for such a responsible post.

Youth is not a vice, Shakhrai's supporters argued. They said he is an expert in parliamentary procedures and has worked in USSR Supreme Soviet commissions.

Before adjourning for a break, deputies cast their votes. The results are expected after 16:00 Moscow time.

Boris Yeltsin then proposed observing a minute's silence in memory of victims of last year's rail disaster in the southern Urals, when dozens of people were killed in a gas explosion.

Several deputies called on their colleagues to work more actively and not to stall progress on key issues.

Yuriy Khramchenkov from Kaluga reminded the deputies that a day of congressional work costs about 350,000 roubles.

However, half an hour was lost today during repeated calls "to work constructively."

Yeltsin, Deputies Consider Deputy Chairmen

LD0406121690 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0830 GMT 4 Jun 90

[Commentator Vladimir Korablev reports on the First Congress of RSFSR People's Deputies and the third session of the USSR Supreme Soviet in Moscow on 4 June—recorded]

[Text] [Korablev] Good day, esteemed listeners. The third working week of the First Congress of RSFSR People's Deputies began with the question of electing a first deputy chairman of the republic's Supreme Soviet and also a third deputy chairman. You will recall that two deputy chairmen were elected on 1 June, but the question of electing a first or third deputy chairman was not resolved. Chairman Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin opened today's session, saying among other things:

[Yeltsin] I consider that we did the right thing to elect a conciliation commission which worked on and discussed in detail a number of candidates—21 in all—for the post of first deputy chairman and the posts of deputy chairmen of the USSR [as heard] Supreme Soviet. The conciliation commission agreed that from among these names the Supreme Soviet chairman should himself propose three alternatives. Accordingly, we elected two deputy chairmen.

But difficulties emerged and none of the alternative candidates was approved. This happened twice. Therefore, I wish to take advantage of my constitutional right to propose one sole candidate for each of the posts of first deputy chairman and deputy chairman. Both candidates belong to the list which was discussed at the conciliation commission.

[Korablev] After an analysis of the work already done and the conciliation commission views, Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin proposed a autonomous republic representative, Ruslan Imranovich Khasbulatov, a people's deputy elected for the Groznyy national-territorial constituency of the Chechen-Ingush ASSR [Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic], for the post of first deputy chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet. Khasbulatov is a faculty head at the Moscow Plekhanov Institute of the National Economy. The candidate explained his program and answered deputies' questions. Here is one of his answers, which concerned price hikes:

[Khasbulatov] As an economist, do you think we could go to a market economy without raising prices? Would you please set out your views briefly and specifically. Maybe you remember, about three years ago we had a very serious debate on whether or not to raise prices. I must tell you straight that at that time virtually all academicians favored a price hike. Only Prof Khasbulatov was against price hikes. During that debate I explained my understanding of the market and my ideas for a transition to this market, without worsening the working masses' position in any real way.

Why did I think it important not to worsen their position? If anybody thinks that their position can be worsened any further, that there are reserves of some kind for further worsening, that person is quite simply mistaken. There are absolutely no reserves for any further worsening. Therefore, various options are possible. But they will only be acceptable if there is no actual price hike.

The point is that the price hike which is now being discussed has nothing whatsoever to do with the transition to the market. The market is one thing, but the price hike has absolutely nothing to do with the transition to it. It is a separate element in overall economic policy. Why am I sure of this? I constantly follow the pronouncements made by representatives of financial and economic departments. I think I am quite well informed about the policy of these departments, including the Ministry of Finance and the State Prices Committee. For some reason I get the impression that the reasons for this are purely fiscal, wholly connected with the budget, with the attempts to sort out, balance the budget, and so on.

That is this program's weakness. I assure you that if these price rises were to be combined in some way with a concrete program for the transition to the market, then I would also certainly give very serious thought to the question of criticism or support, of whether anything can be improved in it.

[Korablev] When Deputy Khasbulatov's candidacy was being discussed, many deputies spoke in support and called on the congress to vote for him. Then Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin proposed Sergey Mikhaylovich Shakhray for the post of deputy chairman of the Republic's Supreme Soviet. Shakhray also spoke about his program and answered questions from deputies. Both candidates have been included in the voting list. When ballot papers have been printed, the deputies will start casting their votes.

Yeltsin Candidates Fail To Win Election

LD0406173490 Moscow TASS in English 1719 GMT 4 Jun 90

[By TASS parliamentary candidates Lev Aksenov and Boris Zverev]

[Text] Moscow June 4 TASS—Russia's Supreme Soviet has hit a "stumbling block" at the First Congress of People's Deputies of the Russian Federation: The positions of first deputy chairman and deputy chairman are still vacant after several rounds of voting.

Only two of the required three deputy chairmen were elected last week.

Previous rounds were multi-candidate elections. But Russia's Supreme Soviet Chairman Boris Yeltsin today availed himself of his constitutional right and suggested only one candidate for each vacancy.

However, neither economist Ruslan Khasbulatov, who ran for the post of the first deputy chairman, nor Moscow legal scholar Sergei Shakhray, suggested as deputy chairman, received the necessary 531 votes as specified by the electoral procedure.

Failures to elect Yeltsin's deputies are becoming chronic. He suggested that Khasbulatov and Shakhray be regarded as acting deputy chairmen and that the congress return to the voting procedure at the end of its work. A stormy reaction followed, with opinions divided.

Yeltsin then suggested that the two candidates stand in the next round of voting. During a keen debate speakers proposed that if the candidacies are turned down again, a break be announced in the work of the congress so that people's deputies could consult their constituents.

The new election will be held on Tuesday morning.

Stalemate, 'No Positive Advances' at Congress

LD0406142990 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1300 GMT 4 Jun 90

[Correspondent Yuriy Korotkov reports from the Congress of RSFSR People's Deputies in Moscow on 4 June]

[Text] Hello comrade radio listerners! I want to say straight away that at the Congress of RSFSR People's Deputies there is again stalemate. As a result of a sharp polarization of forces, I would say that there have been no positive advances today, either. The fact of the matter is that, just a few minutes ago, the chairman of the tellers' commission announced the outcome of the secret vote. It transpires that neither of the two candidates received the required number of votes. I should remind you that Ruslan Imoratovich Khasbulatov had been put forward to fill the post of first deputy chairman of the Russian Supreme Soviet. He received 459 votes, with 443 against. The other candidate was Sergey Mikhaylovich Sharkhray, who had been proposed as deputy chairman of the Russian Supreme Soviet. He got 432 for, and 470 against. Thus, I repeat, neither of the proposed candidates received the required number of votes. As soon as the voting figures were made known, Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin took a time out. Boris Mikhaylovich Isayev, his deputy is presently fulfilling the duties of chairman of the congress.

One people's deputy from Rybink said that he was dismayed at the outcome of the voting. Selfish group interests are ruling at the congress, he said. These have nothing whatever in common with concern for the future of Russia.

The question again arose at the congress of the declaration of Russia's sovereignty which, according to the agenda, is to be discussed and perhaps adopted on 6 June. Mikhail Nikitich Tolstoy, the chairman of the Editorial Commission, reported that the work was proceeding with difficulty, since the congress has essentially split into equal parts. It is very difficult to work, and the commission is encountering the same difficulties in its work to prepare other documents. Incidentally, a Draft Decree of Authority—on the machinery of democracy, as it is known—is in the offing.

Today, too, the deputies honored the memory of those people who died in Bashkiriya. As you will recall, today is the first anniversary of the day of the tragedy on the railway in Bashkiriya following an explosion on a main pipeline.

Then, there have been questions about whether to continue the transmissions on television and radio. In a vote by name, the deputies decided to continue the transmission of the Congress since it is essential for the electorate.

Furthermore, they voted to work on 9 June since there is a terrible shortage of time.

And another thing: the deputies raised the issue of questions from deputies. As before, many ministries and official departments are refusing to answer them. Those top officials who refuse to answer deputies' questions are to be named.

Then again, a group of Irkutsk drivers has asked the Congress to help them and to defend their rights. The point is that last July they took part in a strike and were then all sacked. The Congress has instructed the Russian Federation Procuracy to investigate the matter and report back to the People's Deputies. Steps will be taken after this.

That is probably all there is to say about the work of the Congress of People's Deputies. They are presently dealing with what I would call any other business.

Deputies of Congress 'Divided' Over Issues

LD0406113790 Moscow TASS in English 1102 GMT 4 Jun 90

["Russian Lawmakers Urge Consolidation at Congress" by TASS parliamentary correspondents Kirill Kibrova and Dmitriy Polunin]

[Text] Moscow June 4 (TASS)—Three weeks after the opening of the first Russian Federation Congress of People's Deputies, delegates are still divided over many issues, and most are well aware that without consolidation progress will be hard to make.

Full economic and political sovereignty for Russia can become a rallying call for various political groups represented at the congress, Igor Mozgo, a 31-year-old deputy from Gorkiy who leads a group of deputies called Smena (roughly translated as change) told TASS.

Smena unites about 70 young deputies, he said.

"When we say Smena, we mean a change of generations, views and policy," he explained.

Smena aims to protect young people's interests and take up other issues, facing the Russian Federation," Mozgo said.

Smena does not belong to any block of deputies, but it tilts towards the democratic movement, he said.

Consolidation at the congress can only be achieved through talks and compromises, Lieutenant General Boris Tarasov, a member of a group of 53 military deputies, said.

The main goals, however, will not be compromised, he said.

"We, deputies from the military, are prepared to compromise but only to a certain extent," he said, explaining that the group will stand fast on defence and security issues.

New Leningrad Soviet Chairman Interviewed

WA0406192390 Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian No 12, 30 May 90 p 2

[Report on interview with Anatoliy Sobchak, newly elected chairman of the Leningrad Soviet of People's Deputies, by LITERATURNAYA GAZETA correspondent T. Putrenko; place and date not specified: "Anatoliy Sobchak: 'It Will be Difficult, But We Have To Try..'"]

[Text] [Putrenko] Anatoliy Aleksandrovich, what prompted you, a member of the USSR Supreme Soviet, to campaign for a deputy seat in the city soviet and to agree to nomination to the post of chairman?

[Sobchak] I thought on the whole that I should not run for the Lensovet [Leningrad Soviet] or for the Russian parliament even though I was nominated for this. I think it is almost impossible to combine the work on the legislative committee and the city soviet There was also another fact: I am engaged in my own professional work in the Supreme Soviet and I make bold to judge that I make a real contribution there, and that it is there that I should be. I was never involved in administrative work, and I did not give any thought to holding a position on the regional level. But then the well-known situation arose in the new Lensovet. Elected on a different basis, it is now, in my opinion, the most democratic in the country. However, its very first session began to head into a blind alley, and a large group of deputies requested that I become a candidate for the soviet and later to submit my candidacy for the post of chairman. I did not deem it possible for me to refuse. I have a lot of political experience, and it is my task to share this political experience with the political beginners, to become a coordinator of joint actions, and, perhaps, even a kind of arbitrator in conflicts that arise....

I am still not certain that I acted properly in accepting this offer. My colleagues tell me: "Why do you need this? You are now a famous parliamentarian, you are a successful critic, and you are in the opposition. But when you head the Lensovet, everything will fall on you. You are the one who will be criticized." And they are right. Incidentally, U.S. Senator Mitchell told me: "I do not understand you, Deputy Sobchak! In my country, a move to the regional level would mean the end of a political career, so to speak, "to sell oneself short." But I never dreamed about a political career, and now I think only about one thing: to return to my professional activity. However, I want my children and grandchildren to live differently. In a renewed society. But the path to this other, better life passes through the sphere of politics. So that it becomes necessary to become a politician against one's will. I am convinced—not for long.

[Putrenko] Is the politician's burden a heavy one?

[Sobchak] Heavy and thankless. More than anything in life I fear becoming a professional politician, a person whose 24 hours is filled with various kinds of matters, as a result of which he stops being an educated and cultured person. My last interview with you was devoted to literature...

[Putrenko] You answered the LITERATURNAYA GAZETA questionnaire: "What I Believe Today"...

[Sobchak] Well, today I could not hold the conversation. For the year of work in the Supreme Soviet, I can count on my fingers the number of books that I have read. But as soon as a person stops reading, thinking about what he has read and enriching himself with new ideas, he loses many qualities, including those that are necessary to political activity. Incidentally, this is the tragedy of a majority of the political leaders. Turn your attention to a detail such as this: If you take the books of Platonov and Zamyatin, you will see to what extent they were penetrating and farsighted politicians. How accurately they foresaw what would happen to us! And Dostoyevsky who foresaw the colossal changes in the sphere of morality with the appearance of the totalitarian system!..

[Putrenko] In voting for you, the residents of Leningrad, we will not hide the fact, voted for a new "boss" of the city. How do you assess the legacy left to you? Vladimir Yakovlevich Khodyrev, the former mayor of Leningrad, gave assurance in one of our interviews: "We are handing over the city to the new Lensovet staff in a decent condition."

[Sobchak] I do not know what there is more of in this statement: an inability to critically evaluate oneself or complacency. I will refrain from stronger expressions. The city is in a catastrophic condition. It is sufficient to talk about the ecological catastrophe, which in connection with the construction of the dam, is threatening Leningrad. About the fact that the former "fathers" transformed the former capital of Russia into the center for a military-industrial complex. And so forth and so forth. Time will put everything in place: The new Lensovet will check on the activity of the former leadership and will give it, I suppose, an appropriate mark in the spheres of legislation and in the interests of the residents of Leningrad.

[Putrenko] It is insulting to hear and to read that Leningrad has recently been transformed into a kind of base for conservative forces. The residents of the city elected, according to your own words, the most democratic city soviet in the country. On the other hand, there are the speeches of Nina Andreyeva, "Gorbachev's tireless critic," the openly chauvinistic attacks of the so-called "patriotic" associations, which frightened all party meetings at the end of last year, and, finally, the last action in this category—the "initiative congress" of the future Russian communist party...

[Sobchak] A polarization of democratic and conservative forces has taken place in Leningrad sooner than in other regions of the country. In itself it is natural: This is an inevitable transitional process under conditions of a multiparty system. But from here come the attempts of the right wing forces to break up the democratic movement where it has developed most. Therefore, the bursts of social activity of the reactionaries, especially in Leningrad, are so noticeable. It seems to me that it is necessary to handle such cases with more calm. Democrats should not submit to provocations. I have already said more than once: Democratic forces must not construct their activity as an answer to reactionary attacks. At a minimum, this is not constructive.

[Putrenko] Anatoliy Aleksandrovich, you are a communist. According to Russian Communist Party documents adopted by the "initiating congress," you will also automatically become a member of the Russian Communist Party?

[Sobchak] I am a young communist. My length of party membership is only one and a half years. I joined the CPSU in order to participate in the renewal of life. This is a conscious choice. And now I do not intend to leave the party, at least before the 28th congress. To quit it at the present time means to leave it in the hands of reactionaries. As for the decisions about which you speak—in my opinion, this is political adventurism. One can become a member of any party only in consonance with a citizen's application. I did not submit an application to join the Russian Communist Party in the version of the initiating April "congress," and, naturally, I will not consider myself to be a member of it.

[Putrenko] The new Lensovet began its activity with rather sharp conflicts. One of them arose with party organs on the question of separating the city newspapers, and the other—with the center—regarding Leningrad television, and, finally, the last chronologically, with the Leningrad Oblast Soviet regarding sponsorship assistance to the village.

[Sobchak] I think that quite a few such situations will arise. All of them must be resolved democratically to the maximum possible extent, and tolerantly with respect to various views on problems, but at the same time they must be conducted with a firm, consistent policy associated with adherence to legality and, of course, the interests of the city. It is clear, for example, that the mass media facilities also belong, along with other publishers, to the Lensovet. No one has the right to take papers or, for example, television, away from us in a unilateral way. We will resolve these questions first and foremost in a conciliatory process. If this fails, then in a judicial procedure.

You mentioned the conflict with the Leningrad Oblast Soviet. I would not call what has happened a conflict. This is a serious problem that really demands quick resolution. To maintain the "sponsorship" ties of the city with the village in their previous form is also an impossible matter even in this year. It is necessary already today to put the economic levers into action. For example, to open stalls on the territory of city enterprises that sell not only agricultural products produced by sponsored sovkhozes [state farms], but also products from the personal plots of villagers according to contracted prices. A mutual interest arises. One can also come up with other pressing measures. The main thing, it seems, is for both the city and the oblast soviets to prove themselves more through constructive work and not through ultimatums of the type: "We do not want to give orders to the enterprises!", and, on the other hand, "We will not sow!" Compromises are necessary. At the present time, projects are being developed according to which a free economic zone will be created on the territory of Leningrad and the oblast. A single city and oblast administrative complex should also result. Probably, our two soviets will also be united in the future.

[Putrenko] Whom would you like to see in the job of chairman of the ispolkom [executive committee]? There are rumors in the city that you intend to invite a foreigner for this position.

[Sobchak] But also to sell Leningrad in parts and to assist underground millionaires and cooperative swindlers!.. All of these "reports" were also being spread liberally by our "patriots" in the period of my preelection campaign... There are several candidates for the chairmanship of the ispolkom. A competition has been announced. I would not want to reveal the names of the contenders: They will come out with their own programs, and the one will win whose program is the most promising and interesting. As for a foreign mayor, actually during the visit of a group of U.S. senators to Leningrad, I asked Senator Mitchell, the leader of the Senate delegation, to find for us an industrious, energetic, and progressive former mayor from the large American cities who would agree to come here for half a year to a year in the capacity of an adviser-backup. We are not inhibited by the opinion of an outsider. Senator Mitchell promised to think about it, so I hope we will realize this idea.

[Putrenko] There are numerous matters and problems that demand immediate resolution. What will you start with?

[Sobchak] According to data of various polls, and appeals to deputies and to newspapers, it is apparent: Leningrad residents expect from the new authorities a resolution of acute problems first and foremost in the supply of foodstuffs, housing, and in the area of health services. This is what we will begin with. And also education: The situation in education is terrible and demands radical changes.

In agreeing to assume the responsible and honorable post of chairman of the soviet, I knew what I was getting into. It will be very difficult. But I have to try. I have to prove to the current apparatchiks that I am able not only to criticize, but also to do a job. I have to demonstrate to the whole country how a democratic soviet can organize its work. If we succeed in moving forward at least several steps and show the people of Leningrad that the authorities are being straightforward with the residents, this will be the most important thing in our activity.

Khabarovsk Party Conference First Stage Ends

PM0506121590 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 5 Jun 90 Single Edition p 4

[TASS correspondent report under general heading: "Conferences Held"]

[Text] Khabarovsk, 3 Jun—The first stage of the work of the Khabarovsk Kray party conference has ended. Discussing the drafts of the CPSU Central Committee Platform for the 28th Party Congress and of the CPSU Statutes, the communists of the Amur region noted with alarm the aggravation of the sociopolitical and economic situation in the kray, the decline in the prestige of the kray party organization, and the lack of resolve and dilatoriness in perestroyka in party work. But few specific proposals were submitted aimed at overcoming the crisis and consolidating the broad masses' trust in the party.

The election of the first secretary of the CPSU kraykom ended without results. One of the most popular contenders for the post—V.M. Krysin, general director of the Soviet-Korean "Eksman" enterprise—collected the biggest number of votes after the first round of the secret ballot but unexpectedly withdrew before the second round. The delegates spent two days on a discussion of the professional, political, and moral qualities of five other contenders and on a secret vote. But no one received the trust of the majority and the post of first secretary remained vacant.

The conference examined the delegates to the 28th CPSU Congress from the kray party organization. They include 16 party workers and only two workers.

It was decided to continue the conference's work after the congress.

Razumovskiy Loses Election in Krasnodar Kray

LD0406132490 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1200 GMT 4 Jun 90

[From the "Television News Service" program]

[Text] As you are aware, elections of delegates to the 28th CPSU Congress are now under way. The results of the elections in the rural party constituency in Korenovskiy Rayon, Krasnodar Kray, have caused a sensation. Georgiy Razumovskiy, CPSU Central Committee Politburo member and CPSU Central Committee secretary, was a candidate there. He did not meet with success. He received only 37 percent of the votes, yielding to the secretary of the party committee of the Kirov agricultural farm, who won 53 percent of the votes. That was a Postfaktum agency report.

Ecological Situation in White Sea Worsens

LD0506094690 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 2300 GMT 4 Jun 90

[Text] The ecological situation in the White Sea has worsened. Many marine animals have been washed up on the shore. This time the epicenter of the ecological explosion was the ancient Pomor village of Petominsk, which is several dozen kilometers west of where the first two instances of starfish being washed up en masse occurred.

The situation on the eastern shore of the White Sea has also worsened. Ten dead seals have been found in the area of the Zemlegorsk lighthouse.

Specialists still cannot say what the reason for the disaster was. One suggestion is the jettisoning of rocket fuel by a submarine which was registered this winter. Members of a special commission set up in Arkhangelsk are flying out today to the latest area where marine animals have been washed up.

Mudslides Hit Chechen-Ingush Oil Workers' Town

PM0506113990 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 5 Jun 90 Single Edition p 6

[TASS report: "Mudslides Hit Town"]

[Text] Malgobek, Chechen-Ingush ASSR [Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic]—The mudslides which destroyed dozens of settlements in the autonomous republic's mountain regions last year have again declared their treacherous presence. This time they descended upon the town of Malgobek, completely destroying six multistory and about 50 single-story homes in the old quarter. The gas supply, power lines, and highways are out of service. The rayon newspaper printing plant and its communications center are not functioning. Fortunately, there was no loss of human life.

Additional maintenance and construction industry workers have been brought to the area hit by the natural calamity. Malgobek is a town of oil industry workers. Therefore, the "Grozneft" Association's collective has taken on the main responsibility for its residents. Construction work is going on around the clock. But the manpower and resources are clearly insufficient to repair everything that can be repaired as soon as possible and provide housing for the victims. Malgobek's residents believe that they will not abandoned in their misfortune.

Gorbachev Intervention in Monastery Cited

PM0506093790

[Editorial Report] Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 3 June 1990 Second Edition carries on page 3 under the "Fatherland" rubric and under the headline "Valaam—Island of Treasures" a 550-word Leningrad report by correspondent N. Volynskiy concerning the fate of a monastery on Valaam island in Lake Ladoga, which is gradually falling into ruin. It reads in part as follows:

"Last year Academician D. Likhachev asked the CPSU Central Committee general secretary for help on behalf of the Soviet Culture Fund. 'To Comrade V.A. Medvedev,' M.S. Gorbachev wrote. 'I have already studied this question—a USSR Council of Ministers resolution was adopted as a result. But this does not seem to be enough for certain departments and local organs. Some of our comrades must be definitely put right and the USSR Council of Ministers decisions fulfilled.' Only then did things get moving. The main question was resolved—the handover of the Spaso-Preobrazhenskiy Monastery, along with its entire complex, to believers."

Western Republics

Ivashko Elected Ukraine Supreme Soviet President

LD0406162390 Moscow TASS in English 1553 GMT 4 Jun 90

[By TASS correspondent Aleksey Petrunya]

[Text] Kiev June 4 TASS—Ukrainian Communist Party chief Vladimir Ivashko was elected president of the Ukrainian Supreme Soviet today at the parliament's session in Kiev.

Ivashko is 58. After graduating from the Kharkov Mining Institute in 1956, he was involved in teaching and scientific work and worked in party bodies. Four years ago he was elected secretary and in December 1988 second secretary of the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee.

Ivashko has been Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee first secretary since September 1989 and a member of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee Politburo since December 1989. His working style is very democratic and takes a plurality of opinion into consideration.

In all, 278 deputies voted for Ivashko, 61—against. Other nominees included academician Igor Yukhnovskiy, Professor Vladimir Grinev and Ivan Saly, chairman of the Podol district Council of People's Deputies in Kiev. They are all CPSU members.

There were 12 nominees for the post several days ago, but some candidates decided to withdraw. It is clear that there are polar opinions in the parliament and work will not be easy.

The new president will have to smooth differences and ensure the parliament's fruitful work.

To Relinquish Party Post

LD0506125490 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1200 GMT 5 Jun 90

[Text] As you know, yesterday the Ukrainian parliament elected Vladimir Ivashko, first secretary of the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee, as chairman of the republican Supreme Soviet. The election took place in a difficult atmosphere: the majority of the Democratic bloc of the Ukraine, for instance, even walked out of the hall. Ivashko promised to renounce the post of leader of the Ukrainian communists at the forthcoming congress of the Communist Party of Ukraine.

Meeting Protests Ivashko Holding Two Posts

LD0406132590 Kiev International Service in Ukrainian 1800 GMT 3 Jun 90

[Text] Today, at a multithousand meeting in Kiev, the Ukraine Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] people's deputies from the Democratic Bloc declared their resolute opposition to a situation whereby Vladimir Ivashko would be able to hold the posts of first secretary of the Ukraine Communist Party Central Committee and chairman of the Ukraine SSR Supreme Soviet at the same time. In case these two posts are combined in the hands of the same person, the meeting's participants appealed in their resolution to the republic's electorate to instruct their deputies to boycott the session of the Ukraine SSR Supreme Soviet. The resolution also calls for forming strike committees and committees of civic disobedience with the aim of resisting the combining of these two posts. It also calls for immediate initiation of an all-Ukrainian political warning strike and the unfolding of a campaign for the immediate recall of Ukraine SSR Supreme Soviet deputies who support the stand of the Communist Party of Ukraine Central Committee.

It was decided to send copies of this resolution to all people's deputies of Ukraine.

Ukrainian Republican Party Meets 3 June

LD0406130990 Kiev International Service in Ukranian 1800 GMT 3 Jun 90

[Text] A conference of the Ukrainian Republican Party [URP] was held in Kiev today, at which it was decided to change the phrasing and in some parts, the content, of certain paragraphs of the party's rules. These alterations were demanded at the republic's Council of Ministers after the URP requested legal registration.

In particular, the Council of Ministers demands that the rules should specify that the URP funcitons not only in accordance with the Ukraine Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Constitution, as the original declares, but also in accordance with the USSR Constitution. It also demanded removal from the rules of articles on civic disobedience, and the insertion of the point that the party can be dissolved by the Ukraine SSR Council of Ministers.

It was also decided at the conference to form a commission to discuss these issues at the Ukraine Ministry of Justice.

Donetsk Miners Stress Needs at Meeting

LD0406210790 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 4 Jun 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [Announcer] You may recall that the Donetsk miners' strike committees drew up a whole program of what are, in their opinion, necessary measures for improving living and working conditions. At the present time in Donetsk a meeting between a government commission headed by Ryabev, deputy chairman of the Council of Ministers, and the miners has ended.

[Begin recording] [Correspondent G. Kondaurov, identified by caption] The 47 points submitted by the striking miners were accepted by the government to be fulfilled. Almost a year has passed, and both the sides that signed the protocol on the agreed measures have met to monitor how it is being carried out.

[M.A. Krylov, member of the strike committee, identified by caption] In principle no fundamental measures and solutons have been taken, except for the law on pensions. And to all appearances, according to the work of the commission at the present time here we are especially dissatisfied with the work of the Ministry of the Coal Industry. No specific decisions are being taken.

[Kondaurov] The members of the commission agree that much of what has been promised has not been fulfilled. The miners have not received economic independence. Just as before, the coal is being sold at prices that do not cover extraction costs. The miners are being promised that only in 1992 will material and technical supply get going. The promise to provide miners and their families with apartments in six years is not being backed up by action either. And that is only part of a whole complex of unresolved problems that are creating tension is miners' collection.

This conversation was difficult, at times very hard-hitting, but the constructive stands that the miners took helped in finding an agreement.

[Yu. A. Bondyrev, member of the strike committee, deputy of the oblast comnmittee, identified by caption] We want to resolve our problems ourselves. For example, we must build two large medical complexes—a children's diagnostic complex and a cardiological complex—here in Donetsk, for the whole oblast. It is clear that the government does not have the money to do this. This means that we, not only the coalminers, but all the enterprises in the oblast, want to be permitted to provide 70 percent of the foreign currency needed by means of barter for the construction of these medical institutions.

[Kondaurov] So, you want to sell the above-plan coal?

[Bondyrev] Of course we do. There are no other variants. [video shows scenes at meeting with government commission and speakers]

Transcarpathian Radar Station Plan Halted

LD0406134690 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1200 GMT 4 Jun 90

[From the "Television News Service" program]

[Text] On Friday [1 June] the Television News Service carried a report from the Transcarpathian region, describing the inhabitants' protests against planned construction of a radar station. We have received news an extraordinary session of the oblast soviet has adopted a decision to stop construction of this major military radar station in the Transcarpathians.

Interfront Seeking 'Alternative Power Base'

LD0406152190 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 1005 GMT 4 Jun 90

[Telephone interview with Arkadiy Gerasim, Moldavian radio reporter, by correspondent A. Usas; place, date not given—recorded]

[Excerpts] [Usas] Reports coming from Moldavia are causing concern. Speaking in brief, an alternative power base is being set up there which, as it seems, is happening not only in Moldavia.

However, it seems the situation there is complex indeed. Arkadiy Gerasim, a Moldavian radio reporter, is on the line.

[Begin Gerasim recording] I will explain everything in a minute. This was a congress of deputies of all levels of the Dniestr basin. It took place at 1100 Saturday in Parkany in the Slabadzeysk Rayon on the other side of the Dniestr River, [word indistinct]

The agenda included, and I quote:

1. Means to achieve economic development of the Pridneprovskiy Region in conditions of transition to a market economy.

2. Election of the Coordinating Economic Council of the region.

3. Ensuring the work of the group of deputies of Soviet Moldavia at the Supreme Soviet of the Moldavian Soviet Socialist Republic.

It appears it all turned out to be a screen to adopt a declaration on setting up the so-called Coordinating Economic Council, although it has nothing to do with economics because this council will consist of councils' chairmen, not managers of the economy's enterprises. In other words, an alternative Supreme Soviet has been set up. This is an attempt to use economic problems as a cover. Well some of the deputies gave in, namely their leader, Deputy Khologov, chairman of the Bendery City Executive Committee, and said it will be an economic fist, a reaction to the documents the Supreme Soviet of Moldavia will adopt. [passage omitted] They want to tear off a piece of territory from Moldavia. The trouble is, the greatest part of the economic enterprises is concentrated in the region, such as Tiraspol, Bendery, [words indistinct]. This presents a great deal of danger to our republic. The fact they want to set up a regional (?fund) to introduce favorable prices for the region's population indicates this economic platform in the future will become a political autonomy. [passage indistinct] They claim they will have trading links with all, absolutely everyone, as an independent region. They lean on the Soviet Law on Local Self-Governing Bodies. It says if the Soviets wished, they could set up an association. Using this law as a cover, they are pursuing political goals. This has been admitted, even by many deputies in the interviews they gave me. [passage omitted] [end recording]

[Usas] So these are the victories of the Moldavian Interfront, although A. Gerasim, in our long telephone conversation, said it is quiet in Moldavia. He also said Soviet troops take an active part in these events by lending technical equipment and other support, disseminating leaflets from helicopters, and so on. Servicemen deputies are very active. Well, this is all well-known to us. Therefore it is not too difficult to imagine what the situation is.

By the way, the Gagauz card is being played, too. My collegue said the government was prepared to hold a dialogue, although it will be a very difficult one.

Congress of Non-Moldavian Deputies Meets

LD0306225490 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 3 Jun 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast—recorded]

[Text] [Announcer] In Moldavia there has taken place a Congress of People's Deputies who represent the republic's non-Moldavian population.

[Unidentified correspondent] Deputies from nine towns and rural rayons of the Dnestr Region, among them deputies of the Gagauz nationality demanding their autonomy, gathered at a congress in the Bulgarian village of Parkany, where as in Tiraspol, Bendery, and Rybnitsa, and many villages, they still don't recognize the republic's state flag, the tricolor, adopted by a session of the Supreme Soviet, or the law on state language. They insist on referenda. [video shows congress in session, cutting to following interview]

[A.N. Morozov, people's deputy of the Moldavian Soviet Socialist Republic, identified by screen caption] The fact that we are currently addressing the matter of the economic independence of the Dnestr Region, and of the development of its infrastructure under conditions of a market economy—I think that this is actually the bridge that will enable us to understand one another better. But as concerns those people who have now pushed us to this interethnic strife, we will, naturally, never come to terms with them. In any event, in ideological terms. Our differences are too deep.

[Correspondent] Many deputies are insisting on the creation of autonomy for the Dnestr Region, and all of them, in general, are in favor of a territorial association with its own administration, a coordinating council of the Dnestr region. Among the documents adopted is an appeal in which they reject the resolution of the session of the Moldavian Supreme Soviet on recognizing an independent Lithuanian republic. [video shows deputies discussing, cutting to following interview with V.S. Pushkashu, deputy chairman of the Moldavian Supreme Soviet, identified by caption] Viktor Stepanovich, a congress, an attempt, is under way to set up a parallel government.

[Pushkashu] In point of fact, under discussion are parallel structures of the organs of both state power and administration, and this is impermissible. I think that there are in the hall, after all, people's deputies of the Moldavian Soviet Socialist Republic with the wisdom of life's experience, from the rayons and towns of the Dnestr Region, who, of course, acknowledge, and have to acknowledge that any rash decisions today lead immediately to the creation of tension in our republic. And this is not desirable. And so, I think that if they finally adopt decisions like this on the formation of parallel structures, then, of course, the republican Supreme Soviet will be forced to annul these decisions.

'Sharp' Interethnic Problems in Moldavia Noted

LD0406135390 Moscow World Service in English 1110 GMT 4 Jun 90

[Text] Moldavia, a small republic in the Soviet Union's southwest, has lately been the scene of a sharp interethnic conflict. More from Vitaliy Gurov of Radio Moscow. Here's what he writes:

Interethnic problems in Moldavia are turning more and more from purely ethnic, economic, and human into political ones. Whether we want this or not, but the situation in Moldavia is developing more and more into a state of confrontation between the Moldavian population and the ethnic groups of Russians, Ukrainians, and Gagauzes who form a majority in certain areas of the republic.

Evidence of this is the just-held congress of non-Moldavian People's Deputies—a kind of an alternative power body. These deputies represent several major industrial towns of Moldavia situated mainly in the Dniester River Valley and also the villages where the Gagauzes live. The Russian-speaking population, supported by People's Deputies, refuses to recognize the three-color national flag of the republic approved by the Supreme Soviet and pledges allegiance to the flag of the Soviet Moldavian Republic. They also refuse to abide by the law recognizing Moldavian as the state language of the republic.

My personal opinion, remarks Vitaliy Gurov, is that it's not so much important how many colors the state flag has, and one must be a demagogue to prove that their number may influence the social and political situation in the republic. As far as the language is concerned, I think that people who have lived for many years in the republic should know, by all means, the locally spoken language.

But the participants in the alternative congress of people's deputies showed concern not only for these problems. This is what the People's Deputy Morozov told our reporter:

I think the decision about the economic independence of the Dniester area and the development of its infrastructure in the conditions of a free market is that bridge that will give us an opportunity to understand each other. As for the people who have pushed us to this interethnic strife, I think we'll never get to terms with them, People's Deputy Morozov added.

Such a categorical approach can hardly contribute to the solution of the conflict, comments Radio Moscow's Vitaliy Gurov. The participants in the congress spoke in favor of the establishment of an association of the Dniester area with its own self-government. This is what the deputy chairman of Moldavia's Supreme Soviet, Viktor Puskasu thinks of the whole idea:

What we are seeing is the establishment of parallel structures of government and management bodies and this is inadmissible. I think present in the hall [as heard] of experienced people's deputies of Moldavia representing the regions and cities of the Dniester areas, among others who must realize that any rash decisions lead today to the heightening of tension in the republic and this, said Mr. Puskasu, is undesirable. [sentence as heard]

So much about the situation in Moldavia, concludes Radio Moscow's Vitaliy Gurov. One can only pin hopes on people's deputies' common sense on the desire of the two sides to hold a dialogue to understand each other, after all, confrontation is not the best way of resolving interethnic problems.

Split Reported in Moldavian Parliament

90UN1958A Moscow RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA in Russian 29 May 90 p 4

[Article by correspondent O. Grabovskiy: "Moldavia: Split in Parliament"]

[Text] Dramatic events attended the resumption of the new Moldavian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet session. Having gone into recess for a week to participate in the 17th Moldavian Communist Party Congress, which announced the communists' consolidation, on this occasion the members of parliament elected the chairmen of the standing commissions for local self-government, religion, crime-fighting, state security, and military matters.

Then a draft decree on recognition of the independence of the republic of Lithuania was put before the participants in the session. And here the deputies' opinions were sharply divided, on account of which discussion of the matter was postponed to the following day.

And although the intensity of the emotions in the parliamentary hall had increased, all was within the framework of decorum. Outside its walls things were completely different. From morning on blows were struck at a number of deputies representing the "Unitatya-Yedinstvo" Intermovement and other public formations. In this connection the "Sovetskaya Moldaviya" group of deputies delivered a statement and demanded an assurance of parliamentary immunity. Alas, this elicited no response. Leaving the parliament building in the evening, deputies from Tiraspol and Rybnitsa and a number of other cities were beaten up by pickets who had broken through the protective police cordon. They went back into the parliament building, where they were holed up for two hours.

The next day the "Sovetskaya Moldaviya" group of deputies read out a statement which noted that their repeated demands for protection of the honor and dignity of people's deputies were not being met. The statement proposed the formation of a special Moldavian SSR Supreme Soviet commission and the formulation of measures, up to and including the imposition of a state of emergency, for normalization of the situation in Kishinev and the republic as a whole. It was a question, specifically, of the creation of worker detachments for protecting the constitutional rights of citizens of the Moldavian SSR. Approximately one-third of the deputies walked out of the session.

Mass meetings were held the same day at industrial enterprises in support of the deputies who had walked out of the session, and telegrams were sent to the republic Supreme Soviet and the USSR president. With a noticeably reduced number of deputies the current situation came to be anxiously discussed. Opinions varied. Some proposed a ban on picketing of the parliament building and on mass activities while parliament was in session, others said that this would be an offensive against democracy. A government statement to the newly elected supreme organ of state power on its resignation was tendered.

"The parliamentary crisis testifies yet again that it is easier to win power than to hold on to it," Deputy V. Bulgar observed. "And this situation has come about on account of the fact that many people are confusing the concept of democracy with what is happening today on the streets. If it goes on like this, I and the other agrarian deputies will also walk out."

Moldavian Commission Chairpersons Elected

LD0306202390

[Editorial Report] Kishinev SOVETSKAYA MOLDAVIYA in Russian on 23 May carries on page one an information report on the Moldavian Supreme Soviet session of 22 May. The report notes that M.I. Kotorbay was elected chairman of the Supreme Soviet Commission on Issues of Local Self-Government and Local Management. I.I. Vatamanu was elected chairman of the Supreme Soviet Commission on Issues of Culture and Religion. N.Z. Brynzan was elected chairman of the Commission on Problems of Women, Family Care, Motherhood, and Children. I.G. Kotash, chairman of the Moldavian DOSAAF [Voluntary Society for the Promotion of the Army, Aviation, and Navy] Central Committee, became chairman of the Commission on State Security and Military Issues. V.M. Berlinskiy was elected chairman of the Commission on Issues of the Fight Against Crime.

Moldavian Central Committee Holds Plenary Session

LD0106214290 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 1 Jun 90

[Text] A plenary meeting of the Moldavian Communist Party Central Committee was held in Kishinev. Organizational matters were discussed. The plenum elected the Bureau of the Central Committee and formed an organizational, ideological, social and economic commission, and a commission on party agrarian policy, headed by the secretaries of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Moldavia. It also confirmed the editors of the party press organs. The political leadership of the publications will be in the hands of editorial councils. The plenum was addressed by Luchinskiy, first secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Moldavia.

Caucasus

Second Round of Elections Held in Armenia on 3 June

NC0406121790 Yerevan Domestic Service in Armenian 0600 GMT 4 Jun 90

[Text] Dear radio listeners: Elections for the people's deputies of our republic took place on 20 May 1990.

The reports from the electoral okrugs [national districts] showed that elections were not recognized as having taken place in a number of electoral okrugs, that is, less than half of the registered voters cast their votes.

Based on information from the okrugs' electoral commissions, the central electoral commission has announced that repeat elections were held on 3 June 1990 in 53 electoral okrugs for the election of people's deputies of Soviet Armenia.

The results will be published in the press.

More on Elections

NC0206144490 Yerevan ARMENPRES International Service in Armenian 1215 GMT 1 Jun 90

[Text] Yerevan, 1 Jun (ARMENPRES)—Voters on the electoral list for the elections for the Armenian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] people's deputies numbered 2,137,210. Of these 1,286,464, or 60.19 percent of the electorate, cast their votes.

Two hundred and sixty okrugs were created for the elections. There were 1,307 candidate deputies who ran in 259 out of the 260 okrugs in the 20 May election. There was one candidate deputy in five okrugs, two candidates in 36 okrugs, and three or more in 215 okrugs.

Elections were held in 259 okrugs. People's deputies were elected in 99 okrugs.

In accordance with Article 52 of the Armenian SSR law on the election of people's deputies, a second round of elections will be held on 3 June in 82 okrugs, where more than two candidates ran and neither got elected.

In accordance with Article 53 of the law on elections, a second round of elections will be held within two months in 70 okrugs where the elections were not recognized as having taken place, and in six okrugs where the elections were considered invalid as a result of blatant violation of the law.

The election results have not yet come in from two election okrugs of Yerevan city.

Armenian Ministry Reports Weapons Seizures

NC0506140290 Yerevan Domestic Service in Armenian 1630 GMT 4 Jun 90

[Statement issued by the Armenian Internal Affairs Ministry; place and date not given]

[Text] Alarming reports have again been reaching the republic's Internal Affairs Ministry over the last few days concerning attacks carried out in order to seize arms. A group of individuals armed with automatic weapons attacked (?soldiers) guarding national economic installations in Oktemberyan City on 31 May. After encountering resistance, these individuals escaped in a VAZ-469 car which had no license plate.

The next day, unidentified persons halted a military vehicle carrying automatic weapons in a newly developed district of Oktemberyan. Threatening to set off a hand grenade, they forced the soldiers out of the vehicle and drove away in it.

An attack against troops guarding the railway in [placename indistinct] rayon resulted in the seizure of two automatic weapons.

The arms are being seized by criminal elements whose acts are seriously destabilizing the situation in the republic. This is confirmed by the incident which took place at the intersection of Kalinin and Ordzhonikidze Streets on the night of 1 June. As a traffic accident was being investigated, a group of persons approached in an car without a license plate, opened fire with a pistol, and escaped.

A military [word indistinct] was fired upon on 1 and 2 June. Attacks were also carried out against the militarized defence workers of the railway from whom arms were also seized.

New Armenian Interior Minister Appointed

NC0506112190 Yerevan Domestic Service in Armenian 0500 GMT 5 Jun 90

[From the review of KHORHRDAYIN HAYASTAN]

[Text] The decree of the republic's Supreme Soviet on the appointment of (?Pola) Galustyan as the republic's internal affairs minister has been published. A biographical note about the new minister has also been published.

Nationalists Say Moscow Behind 27 May Events

NC0406143290 Yerevan International Service in Armenian 1530 GMT 2 Jun 90

[Report by Sevata Gazaryan on a rally organized by the administrative board of the Armenian Pannational Movement in Freedom Square in Yerevan on 1 June—recorded]

[Excerpts] Hundreds of thousands of people gathered in Freedom Square, which resembled an undulating sea.

There was an outburst of protest, reflecting the accumulated complicated problems. [passage omitted]

Levon Ter-Petrosyan, a member of the administartive board of the Armenian Pannational Movement, addressed the rally as follows:

[Begin recording] A monstrous crime has been committed against our nation and people. The result was 26 killed and more than 60 injured by gunfire. The first question that arises is what was the motive for this crime? It is obvious to all that [passage indistinct] there are forces in Armenia which cooperate with the center and who are interested in the destabilization of the situation in the republic in order to find a pretext for introducing the Army into Armenia, declaring a state of emergency, and so on, with the simple intention of saving their regime. [end recording]

Levon Ter-Petrosyan and other speakers called on the people to participate in tomorrow's [3 June] second round of elections for people's deputies of the Armenian republic. The future of Armenia depends on the correct election of a new parliament.

Funeral of Officer Killed in Armenia Described

PM0406145390 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 1 Jun 90 Single Edition p 5

[Report by special correspondent S. Shevtsov: "Standoff"]

[Text] Yerevan—Armenia is in mourning—people are burying those who died in armed clashes with troops. Who are they, these mainly young Armenian guys? I have heard people here calling them "fidanns"—people's fighters. But what are the soldiers and officers subjected to a surprise attack to call them, what are the mothers, wives, and children of servicemen who have received terrible news from Armenia to call them?

Yesterday internal troop servicemen took their leave of Lieutenant Colonel Vyacheslav Chekmarev, deputy commander of a unit. Soldiers carried the open coffin along the line of uncovered bowed heads. Spent cartridge cases and broken glass were still strewn around, the barrack windows yawned like black holes, and the smell of powder seemed to hang in the air from the recent brutal battle. Newspapers have already written about the circumstances of the officer's death, but I will add to this sad tale new evidence from his fellow servicemen.

"I was sent with Lt. Col. Chekmarev and several soldiers from the unit in two armored personnel carriers to assist our column under fire from guerrillas," Lt. Boris Bachek, platoon commander, said. "When we drove up to the height from which there was particularly heavy firing, Chekmarev left the armored personnel carrier along with us and lay low. Then he shouted to me: 'Look after the people. Two follow me!' Private Vovchenko and Pvt. First Class Makhayev followed him..."

"Chekmarev could have merely directed the operation and left the task to the lieutenant, but he led his subordinates himself," Col. Nikolay Gnes, unit commander, continued. "And he went with them to the emplacement, where there were guerrillas with a machinegun, a carbine, and a mortar. A bullet hit Chekmarev above his bulletproof vest... We loaded him and Pvt. Vovchenko, who had also been injured in the chest, into the armored personnel carrier and sent them to hospital. But there were new obstacles in their path. It took approximately half an hour to dismantle them—maybe just those minutes cost Chekmarev his life. In hospital his final words were: 'Operate on the soldier first.'"

So, one more monstrous, senseless death. Will it be the last? Twelve internal troop servicemen are now in civilian and military hospitals, some of them seriously injured. Lt. Pavel Tereshchenko is paralyzed. And at the same time the most improbable rumors are spreading around the city. That they, these guys, are themselves to blame for everything. That servicemen chased children through the streets in armored personnel carriers and crushed them. Gossips put at several hundred the number of people injured and killed just at the station, where guerrillas tried to disarm a troop guard, while defining the tragedy itself as a "provocation by the center." And once again in this situation typical of hot spots bullets, lies, insults, provocations—everything is directed against servicemen and their families. The mood of officers and their relatives in Yerevan is one of despondency.

The aforementioned Col. Gnes described how he received a report one day that guerrillas had seized weapons from a rayon internal affairs department.

"We drove up," the officer recalled, "and not a single militiaman bore even a scratch to attest that he had offered resistance so as not to give up his combat weapon. And their faces revealed total calm..."

On the unit's territory officers' wives came up to me with children—quite a few of them have now taken refuge here. One of my interlocutors, Yelena (I will not give her surname for understandable reasons), had just returned to the unit from a store and said how many threats against her and the servicemen she now had to hear. Her voice and fingers were trembling, and her frail body was shaking. "Where is the guarantee that we are safe?" she asked. "I am a Russian, from Leningrad, but do Russia's people's deputies know under what conditions we find ourselves here? Will they perhaps tear themselves away from their own problems and discuss at the Congress our pain and anxiety and place us under their protection at least in some way?"

Questions, questions... How are we to reply to them? Meanwhile, the dangerous standoff is continuing, and the situation demands its immediate resolution. Not by force but by political methods alone, and there must be no delay.

Armenian Draft Law on Presidential Post Published

NC0406124790 Yerevan International Service in Armenian 1530 GMT 3 Jun 90

[From the republican press review]

[Text] The press has published Armenian republic's [draft] law on the election of the president of the republic. The [draft] law specifically provides that any citizen of Armenia aged between 35 to 65 can be elected president. The same person cannot occupy that post for more than two successive terms. The elections shall be held on the basis of equal and direct voting by secret ballot. The president of Armenia cannot hold the post of people's deputy at the same time.

New Organ of Georgian Council of Ministers

LD2305132890 Tbilisi ZARYA VOSTOKA in Russian 9 May 90 P4

[Summary] The first issue of 'REPUBLIKA', the organ of the Georgian Soviet Socialist Republic Council of Ministers, was published on 6 May. The paper is to be published once a week and will cover a wide range of issues.

Central Asia

Turkmen Party Apparatus To Face 30 Percent Cut

PM0506101190 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 4 Jun 90 Second Edition p 2

[Report by correspondent M. Volkov under the rubric "Official": "Turkmen Communist Party Central Committee Plenum"]

[Text] Ashkhabad, 3 Jun—An organizational plenum of the Turkmen Communist Party Central Committee has concluded its work. It examined questions of structural transformations to the Central Committee. In particular, all the Central Committee departments were abolished, and six party commissions were set up, comprising only Central Committee members. The commissions are headed by members of the Communist Party Central Committee Bureau. Apparatus workers will henceforth fulfill the functions of advisers, and it has been decided to reduce their numbers in the republic as a whole by 30 percent.

At the Communist Party Central Committee plenum communists arrived at the opinion that in the present situation party organizations should be set up at places of residence. It is proposed to agree to an increase in the prices of meat, bread, and bakery products, but to sell flour to the population at the former prices and to compensate for the difference out of the republic budget.

The plenum was addressed by S.A. Niyazov, first secretary of the Turkmen Communist Party Central Committee and chairman of the republic Supreme Soviet.

Uzbek Authorities 'Forced' To Restrict Sales

PM0506085790 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 1 Jun 90 Morning Edition p 6

[Report by Andrey Orlov: "Identity Card for Bread?"]

[Text] Tashkent—A resolution passed by the Uzbek SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Council of Ministers authorizes the sale of goods only on production of identity documents as of 30 May.

The new resolution tightens up trading procedure following the adoption in April of a resolution by the republic Council of Ministers restricting the export of certain kinds of goods from Uzbekistan.

"The provisional measure adopted is severe but has been forced on us," it was explained to me at the Uzbek SSR Council of Ministers. "The events of recent days bound up with the transition to market relations have, unfortunately, gotten people agitated. The shelves in the stores emptied before one's eyes. The need arose to stabilize the situation, to ensure that everyone can get food and other items."

State of Emergency Declared in Kirghizia

LD0506061290 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0518 GMT 5 Jun 90

[Reort by TASS correspondent Boris Maynayev]

[Text] Frunze 5 Jun (TASS)—A state of emergency has been declared in the territory of Osh town, the center of Osh Oblast in Kirghizia, and the rayons around the town. The decree of the Kirghiz Soviet Socialist Republic Surpeme Soviet Presidium imposing the state of emergency was promulgated today by the mass media. This step was taken because of the demands of the Kirghiz and Uzbek communities in connection with a conflict arising out of land plots for the construction of individual housing.

A group of Kirghiz decided to seize without authorization part of the agricultural land of the oblast's suburban farmland and use it for housing. The housing situation in the oblast is quite tight. A group of Uzbeks also came out with demands to be given land. And this led to clashes. There have been casualties. Intervention from the forces of law and order was needed. A government commission has been set up to sort out the conflict. Major General Viktor Goncharov, internal affairs minister of the Kirghiz Soviet Socialist Republic, has been appointed commandant of the territory.

More than half the population of the area are Kirghiz and about one third are Uzbek.

Housing Causes Clashes

AU0506082690 Paris AFP in English 0749 GMT 5 Jun 90

[Text] Moscow, June 5 (AFP)—Six people were killed and about 200 were injured in fighting between Kirghizians and Uzbeks Monday in the central Asian republic of Kirghizia, part of which was put under a state of emergency, a spokesman for the Interior Ministry in Moscow said Tuesday. An eight-hour night curfew was also imposed, the spokesman told AFP.

Fighting broke out Monday in a collective farm near Osh, in the south of the republic, after a group of Kirghizians of Turkic origin tried to build houses on state-owned farmland claimed by Uzbekhs, according to TASS news agency.

"Ten thousand Uzbekhs and 1,500 Kirghizians fought over the building of individual houses on the territory of the Lenin kolkhoz [collective farm]," the Interior Ministry spokesman said. Communist Party and government officials went to the area to try to calm passions, without success, the spokesman said. Security forces fired in the air, but the Uzbekhs retaliated by throwing petrol bombs at the troops. The crowds then headed for the town of Osh, setting fire to seven houses, a number of cars and looting shops along the way. They also attacked prisons and police stations but were repulsed, the spokesman said.

Some 900 security force personnel were drafted to try to keep the warring groups apart, he added. Twenty-one members of the security forces were hurt, one of them seriously, and 110 people were hospitalized, including one who sustained bullet wounds, the spokesman said. Fifty-one people were arrested.

General Viktor Goncharov, the republic's interior minister, has been put in charge of the region. Road blocks have been set up on roads leading into Osh and Interior Ministry patrols are patrolling the streets. Official buildings are under guard, the spokesman added. Kirghizians, who make up more than half the local population, speak an Iranian dialect, but are mostly Sunni Moslems. Uzbekhs account for a third of the population, TASS said.

Deaths, Injuries Reported

AU0506072790 Paris AFP in English 0723 GMT 5 Jun 90

[Excerpt] Moscow, June 5 (AFP)—Six people were killed and about 200 injured in fighting between Kirghizians and Uzbeks in the central Asian republic of Kirghizia, part of which was placed under a state of emergency, a spokesman for the Interior Ministry in Moscow told AFP Tuesday.

Twenty-one members of the security forces were hurt, one of them seriously, and 110 people were hospitalized, including one who sustained bullet wounds, the spokesman said. Fifty-one people were arrested.

Fighting broke out in a collective farm near Osh after a group of Kirghizians, of Turkic origin, tried to build houses on state-owned farmland claimed by Uzbekhs, according to TASS news agency. [passage omitted]

Report on Sentencing of Kazakh Election Fraudsters

PM0506102190 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 3 Jun 90 Morning Edition p 6

[Report by Oleg Stefashin under the rubric "Direct Line; IZVESTIYA Correspondents Report": "Court Sentence"]

[Text] Karaganda—On 30 May the trial of K. Zhanysov and S. Saganovich, charged with violating the Kazakh SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] law on elections of local soviet deputies ended in Kiyevka settlement.

As IZVESTIYA has already reported, K. Zhanysov, chairman of the No. 507 precinct electoral commission, and S. Saganovich, erstwhile second secretary of the Nurinskiy All-Union Leninist Communist Youth League Raykom [Rayon Committee], had forged electoral documents, thus ensuring "victory" at the elections for A. Navoyenko, first secretary of the party raykom. After the cheating had been discovered, the party functionary had to abandon both his deputy's seat and the post he held. The direct participants in this disgraceful story were also punished: The party raykom bureau expelled them from the CPSU and the oblast prosecutor's office initiated criminal proceedings against them.

The trial, which began three weeks ago, attracted wide attention, primarily because of the unique nature of what was happening. After all, as is well known, so far violators of the law on elections have gotten away with a lot. In practice they were not even brought to book and this naturally gave rise to floods of complaints and caused a new wave of abuses during the election campaigns. The outcome of the Nurinskiy Rayon story was different. The Osakarovskiy Rayon court found K. Zhanysov and S. Saganovich guilty of violating the law on elections and sentenced both to two years of corrective work. The court issued a court report against the Nurinskiy Rayon Soviet Executive Committee which had displayed intolerable negligence in preparing and holding the local soviet elections.

Kazakh Social Democratic Party Founded

PM0406155190 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 3 Jun 90 First Edition p 3

[Report by correspondent Colonel A. Ladin under the "Direct Line" rubric: "Trial of Strength"]

[Text] Alma-Ata—According to KAZTAG reports, the constituent conference of the Social Democratic Party of Kazakhstan was held in Alma-Ata. It was attended by about 100 delegates from seven oblasts. The new party intends, within the framework of the republic's Constitution and together with other democratic movements, to promote the radical implementation of economic and social reforms. It is against national exclusiveness and hostility toward other peoples, and upholds market relations as the main regulator of economic life.

It is planned to establish close contacts with similar parties in other Union republics and foreign countries and with the Socialist International.

Eastern Border District Holds Party Conference

LD0406181290 Alma-Ata Domestic Service in Russian 1400 GMT 24 May 90

[Text] A party conference of the Red Banner Eastern Border District has taken place in Alma-Ata. The delegates discussed a report by Major General Bogdanov, Military Council member and district political department head, on the progress of perestroyka in party political work in the interests of reliably guarding the USSR state border.

The district political department and the units' political departments and party organizations had, in recent years, begun to exert more effective influence on ensuring the combat readiness of border troops and strengthening military discipline. Outmoded methods of work and excessive paperwork and meetings were being forced out. At the same time, political methods of leadership were still being mastered slowly, cases of administration by injunction were being allowed to occur, and party influence on public organizations was inadequate.

The conference deemed it essential to more persistently enhance the role of party organizations and political organs of the forces in implementing the new concept of guarding the state border through renewing party political work and democratizing the life of party and military collectives.

A new membership of the district party control commission was elected, as were delegates to the 28th CPSU Congress, the 17th Kazakhstan Communist Party Congress and the 19th Kirghizia Communist Party Congress. Taking part in the conference's work were Anufriyev, second secretary of the Kazakhstan Communist Party Central Committee; Tyulebekov, Alma-Ata Oblast Party Committee first secretary; Colonel General Vertelko, USSR KGB border guard troops first deputy chief.